DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 381 TE 000 020

AUTHOR	Gibson, William M.; And Others
TITLE	The Situation of English: 1963.
INSTITUTION	Modern Language Association of America, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	63
NOTE	41p.; Reprinted from "PMLA," September 1963, v78 n4, Pt2
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.15
DESCRIPTORS	*American Literature, *Curriculum Development, Curriculum Planning, Curriculum Research, English Curriculum, English Departments, *English Instruction, *English Programs, Institutes (Training Programs), Literature Appreciation, *Literature Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Project English

ABSTRACT

Six articles report on problems confronting English teaching and scholarship. Selections are by (1) William M. Gibson and Edwin H. Cady, who survey the present state of textually accurate editions of American authors; (2) John C. Gerber, who writes on the success of 20 Commission on English Institutes conducted during the summer of 1962 as significant efforts to up-grade English in the schools; (3) John Ashmead, who reports on the British Council Conference on the teaching of English literature overseas held at Cambridge, July 1962; (4) Ralph C. M. Flynt, who presents the purposes and long-range possibilities of the U. S. Office of Education's Project English; (5) J. N. Hook, who gives an account of the first year of Project English; and (6) James R. Squire, who comments on the efforts of college English departments and various educational associations to improve English teaching. (JM)

CONTENTS

Editions of American Writers, 1963. By WILLIAM M. GIBSON and EDWIN H. CADY 1

The 1962 Summer Institutes of the Commission on English. By JOHN C. GERBER 9

English Literature Overseas. By JOHN ASHMEAD 26

The U. S. Office of Education Looks at Project English. By RALPH C. M. FLYNT 30

Project English: The First Year. By J. N. HOOK 33

College English Departments and Professional Efforts to Improve English Teaching. By JAMES R. SQUIRE 36

The following articles, reprinted from *PMLA* (*Publications of the Modern Language Association,* September 1963, Part II) bring together the latest and most authoritative reports on some of the important problems facing English teaching and English scholarship today. The understanding of our national literature both at home and abroad depends, first of all, upon its availability. The first article, by W. M. Gibson and E. H. Cady, reveals the deplorable state of editions of American authors. The problem that the British are now having interpreting their literature to countries in Asia and Africa that have traditionally used British literature as the basis for their study of English is indicated by John Ashmead's report on the Cambridge conference. John Gerber reports on the success of the twenty Commission on English Institutes conducted during the summer of 1962—the most significant effort yet made to up-grade English in the schools. Finally R. C. M. Flynt, J. N. Hook, and J. R. Squire comment upon the progress of the U.S. Office of Education's "Project English," and of the relation between English scholars, the USOE, and other professional groups concerned with the improvement of English.

Literacy underlies the success of our whole educational enterprise, indeed of our national life. Proper understanding of the classic literature in our language is the foundation of genuine literacy. These articles have been reprinted in the hope that they will reveal to legislators, and to the interested public, the complexities and some of the more promising avenues for the improvement of literacy in American life.

PMLA

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Issued Five Times a Year

VOLUME LXXVIII SEPTEMBER 1963 NUMBER 4, PART 2

EDITIONS OF AMERICAN WRITERS, 1963: A PRELIMINARY SURVEY

BY WILLIAM M. GIBSON AND EDWIN H. CADY

THAT THIS has become an age of criticism is a commonplace. But that the very fact of our critical concern has also produced in the United States a generation of sensitive and, for historical and technical reasons, uniquely competent editors of literary texts is far less generally known. Critical concentration on the verbal subtlety of novelists as well as poets has strengthened the desire to read "clear text." Attention paid to textual revisions has sharpened critical insight just as regard for the whole effects of whole works has enriched response. The need to know all a writer wrote in order to interpret truly any part of it is once more recognized as essential by the serious critic. New editions of letters and collections of criticism appear. Critics compile bibliographies. Biography and literary history flourish.

Nevertheless, as one might expect in so pragmatic a society as ours, where history often seems a more serious form of discourse than literature to the popular or political mind, it is energetic and resourceful historians who have taken the lead to produce complete, scholarly editions. Sixteen volumes thus far of the papers of Thomas Jefferson have been published by the Princeton University Press under the editorship of Julian Boyd. Leonard W. Labaree, editor, and the Yale University Press, publisher, have issued five volumes of Benjamin Franklin's works. Lyman Butterfield, the Massachusetts Historical Society, and the Harvard University Press have embarked on the immense task of editing the papers of several generations of Adamses; they published four volumes in 1961. Columbia University Press has begun to publish Alexander Hamilton; the University of Kentucky Press, Henry Clay; Princeton University Press, Woodrow Wilson; the University of Chicago Press and the University of Virginia, James Madison. Plans are afoot to edit the writings of John Jay, John C. Calhoun, James Knox Polk, Albert Gallatin, and very probably other political thinkers in editions of which the authors of this survey are not yet aware.

The historians enjoy the advantage of a central agency, the National Historical Publications Commission, which since its creation by President Truman in 1950 has served as a planning and screening board. The Commission now proposes to enlarge its functions beyond advising and serving as a clearing-house and to seek substantial funds from the Congress in order to publish documents which are clearly the responsibility of the federal government, as well as to seek support from the foundations for all the publishing projects in being and in prospect.

The historians have thus initiated an impressive series of editions of American statesmen with nearly minimum funds. The performing artists of the country have received intelligent, sympathetic backing from the White House, and aid in such concrete form as Lincoln Center. President Kennedy has created a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. (It is not yet clear whether the term includes literature and literary scholarship.) American literary scholars have produced or are producing splendid editions of Chaucer, and Milton's prose works, and Boswell's journals, and Donne's sermons, and the works of Dryden and Johnson and Walpole, and documents of the London stage during the Restoration; and these great *opera* have earned the ungrudging praise of their English colleagues. Thus, there is no need for wonder that literary scholars are finally turning to the enterprise of

editing the important American writers in clear text. They are now seriously addressing themselves to the questions, What editions are now being published? What writers ought to be published next? How can the chief American writers be published within *one* decade or *one* generation rather than two or three?

With the generous help of the participants in two Conferences on Editions of American Authors sponsored by the Modern Language Association in June and again in October 1962, the present writers here attempt answers to the first two questions.

Editions in Being

Of all the "collected" or "complete" or "definitive" editions of American writers yet published, many of them useful big editions issued in the late nineteenth century, it is generally recognized that only two can stand without major revisions and additions. One is *The Centennial Edition of Sidney Lanier*, published, under the general editorship of Charles Anderson, by Johns Hopkins University Press in 1945 in 10 volumes, with an editorial staff including Paull F. Baum, Kemp Malone, Clarence Gohdes, Garland Greever, Cecil Abernethy, Philip Graham, and Aubrey H. Starke. The edition is based on manuscript essays, poems, and letters as well as Lanier's printed volumes, and its text is authoritative. The other is *The Poems of Emily Dickinson, Including variant readings critically compared with all known manuscripts*, edited by Thomas H. Johnson in 3 volumes, with *The Letters of Emily Dickinson* in three volumes which Professor Johnson produced with Theodora Ward, associate editor. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press published the two sets in 1955 and 1958. After the murky history of earlier editing and piecemeal publication, these editions of the poems, "uncorrected" and in order of composition, and of the letters, unbowdlerized, have understandably initiated a new era in the study of Emily Dickinson.

Editions Being Published

But excellent editions of two poets, one minor, one major, do not make an available literature. Fortunately, several major editions are in process, with early volumes published. For example, Gay Wilson Allen and Sculley Bradley, with an editorial advisory board consisting of Roger Asselineau, Harold W. Blodgett, Charles E. Feinberg, Clarence Gohdes, Emory Holloway, Rollo G. Silver, and Floyd Stovall, have undertaken *The Collected Writings of Walt Whitman* in 15 volumes, and New York University Press published in 1961 two of the four or five volumes of *The Correspondence*, well edited by Edwin H. Miller. *Leaves of Grass* in both a variorum edition and a reader's edition, the prose, the notebooks, the fiction, the journalistic writings, and a bibliography are still to come, from Harold Blodgett, Floyd Stovall, William White, Edward Grier, Thomas Brasher, and Herbert Bergman. The future rate of publication (if not the future) of this extraordinary edition is perhaps implied in Professor Allen's description of the effort as "a million dollar project without a million dollars." He concludes that, without any endowment and with only the usual sources of support for the editors, all concerned are "erecting a monument to academic courage, faith, generosity, and scholarly work." Professors Allen and Bradley would be the first, however, to welcome material subvention to the individual editors in order to prevent further academic self-immolation, to speed up the preparation and publication of *The Collected Writings*, and in effect to assure the completion of the edition. The edition draws heavily upon both printed editions and manuscript resources such as the unmatched collection of Mr. Feinberg and the many collections in libraries of universities, such as Yale, Duke, Pennsylvania, and Texas, as well as the Library of Congress and the New York Public Library.

The Centenary Edition of the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne is unique among editions in progress —volume I, *The Scarlet Letter*, has been published —in two respects: it has been financially backed by the English Department, the University Libraries, and the Graduate School of a university, Ohio State; and it is the policy of the general editors William Charvat, Roy Harvey Pearce, and Claude G. Simpson and of the textual editor Fredson Bowers to collate all the authorized editions and printings of a given Hawthorne title through 1900, by sight when necessary and by using the Hinman collating machine whenever possible. This machine, originally developed by Charlton Hinman at the Folger Shakespeare Library to speed collation of seventy-nine first folios of Shakespeare, has been described as "an optical device that makes it possible to study two impressions of the same page from two supposedly identical printings simultaneously, and to detect minute variations that elude the human eye."

The system for establishing Hawthorne's text, as followed at the Ohio State center, is in general to sight-collate all new editions against the first edition, and to machine-collate the first and last printings of each edition. If the first edition is

from standing type, where author's corrections may be introduced at any time during the printing run, then cross-collation of copies randomly selected is indicated. Collating teams at both Ohio State University and the University of Virginia, under the direction of Fredson Bowers and his associate textual editor, Matthew J. Bruccoli, will complete a collating schedule for each text.[1] Edward F. Davidson will edit the manuscripts of Hawthorne's "last phase," and Nelson F. Adkins will establish the canon of the tales. The purpose of this complex procedure is of course to alter a basic copy-text (usually either the manuscript or the first edition) only with later variant readings that are clearly the author's or that correct printer's errors. The Hawthorne editors, it should be noted, are fully aware that determining verbal variations as the author's, once the variations have been found by collating teams, is an act of criticism and a matter of experience and discrimination beyond the capacity of most graduate student collators and all machines.

This very ambitious edition raises interesting questions. One is whether collating editions published after the writer's death, as in the case of *The Scarlet Letter*, is necessary. Another is whether the edition cannot include *The American Notebooks* in the text which Randall Stewart so brilliantly restored from the often-blacked-out manuscript and Professor Stewart's *English Notebooks*, published by Yale University Press in 1932 and the Modern Language Association in 1941 respectively. Equally, to be complete, the edition should encompass Hawthorne's correspondence, and the French and Italian notebooks, which Norman Holmes Pearson is preparing for publication. A third question has to do with financing: can the university administration see this superb project through to completion? Still other questions are raised by the editorial strategy of the Hawthorne editors—questions which editors of current and planned editions must take into account. When, as happens, an author can be presumed never to have corrected any edition following the first, is machine collation necessary? That is, in such cases will the traditional sight-reading of one text against a subsequent text twice forwards and twice backwards suffice? Whatever the answers, it seems probable that Hinman collating machines will in the future become available in various parts of the United States, and that editors of other editions will want to consider the result to be achieved from cross-collating early and late copies within the first printing from the same typesetting or plates.

The Whitman and Hawthorne editions are thus well launched, and already are cause for giving two hearty, uninvidious cheers—the third to be reserved for the day when their editors find truly adequate financial support to bring the last volumes into print. On the other hand, the Hendricks House edition of Herman Melville, which began publication so bravely at the end of World War II, has now lost headway almost completely, and has become a source of profound discouragement for most of the editors. Howard Vincent conceived the idea; Walter Hendricks agreed to publish the sixteen volume set; and editors were selected for the separate volumes. *Collected Poems*, edited by Professor Vincent, appeared in 1947 and was followed by Egbert Oliver's *Piazza Tales* in 1948. By 1950 a good many of the volumes were ready for publication in manuscript, but the publisher could not afford to bring out more than one at a time. *Pierre*, edited with a long analytic introduction by Dr. Henry A. Murray, was published in 1947, and Luther S. Mansfield and Howard Vincent brought out their edition of *Moby-Dick* in 1952, a volume distinguished for its thorough annotation. *The Confidence Man* followed in 1954, edited by Elizabeth S. Foster, with fragments of the surviving manuscripts. But since 1954, only one volume has been printed, Walter E. Bezanson's *Clarel:* it has not really been published. The other editors have largely suspended work on their volumes, though many of their manuscripts are ready for publication or might be made ready in a short time. These are: Charles Anderson and Gordon Roper, *Typee;* Willard Thorp, *Redburn;* Merton Sealts, *Uncollected Prose;* Gordon Roper, *Israel Potter;* and Howard Vincent, *White-Jacket.* Merrell R. Davis ceased work on his edition of

[1] For example, the collating schedule of *The Scarlet Letter* was as follows:

1st edition (1850, type) vs 2nd edition (1850, standing type and re-set type). Machine and sight.
1st edition vs 3d edition (1850, re-set, plated). Sight.
1st edition vs English edition (1851, new, unauthorized). Sight.
1st edition vs Little Classics (1875, new, plated). Sight.
1st edition vs Red-Line (1878, new, plated). Sight.
1st edition vs Riverside (1883, new, plated). Sight.
1st edition vs Autograph (1900, new, plated). Sight.
3d edition vs New Fireside (same plates but 1886). Machine.
Little Classics vs Concord(same plates but 1899). Machine.
Riverside vs Fireside (same plates but 1909). Machine.
Autograph vs Old Manse (same plates but 1904). Machine.
Red-Line vs Red-Line (same plates but 1880). Machine.

Eight copies of the first edition were cross-collated on the machine, and five copies of the second edition were similarly cross-collated.

Mardi, since publication seemed remote, and left it incomplete at his death. Harrison Hayford and Walter Blair have published their edition of *Omoo* privately, through a printer in Italy.

In this impasse, Merrell Davis and William H. Gilman, collecting 271 letters of the utmost importance and noting in a checklist unlocated letters which may be "lost, destroyed, or simply hidden from the public," edited *The Letters of Herman Melville* for publication by Yale University Press in 1960. Similarly, Professors Hayford and Sealts published, from the manuscript, the most difficult of all Melville's texts to establish, *Billy Budd, Sailor, An Inside Narrative*, with the University of Chicago Press in 1962. Having to deal with a manuscript on which Melville was still at work at his death, they have supplied both a "reading text" (as Melville might have finished the work) and a "genetic text" (for the scholar who wishes to remount the stream of Melville's composition).

Even in the face of immense difficulties, a complete edition of Melville concluding with a bibliography, as the Whitman and Hawthorne editions will, is strongly indicated: most students of American literature would give it first priority in any concerted effort to establish the full text of the chief American writers. Several trade publishers and university presses have expressed a strong interest in publishing a Melville edition that would be more closely and consistently supervised in the editing, totally re-set and better printed, with primary emphasis on clear text. *Time* is running out, even as *strength* is greater than ever among Melville's scholar-critics. *Patience* for good reason grows short. *Cash* in the form of time for the editors is the necessary catalyst to make Melville accessible in his entirety in a lasting edition. That the need is unquestionable is proved by the announcement of Russell & Russell, Inc., that they will republish by photo-offset *The Collected Writings of Herman Melville*, the 16 volumes of Constable's Standard Library Edition originally published from 1922 to 1924. The five hundred sets of this edition will usefully fill the gap between the incomplete Hendricks edition and the complete edition envisioned; but they will not and cannot take its place.

Despite the failure of the Hendricks House Melville, further good evidence of a new age of scholarly accomplishment in this country is the publication of Paul Ramsey's edition of *Freedom of the Will* in 1957 and John E. Smith's edition of *Religious Affections* in 1959, the initial volumes in *The Works of Jonathan Edwards* of the Yale University Press. Perry Miller is the general editor of the series, heading an editorial committee whose members are Sydney E. Ahlstrom, Roland H. Bainton, Vincent Daniels, Sidney E. Mead, H. Richard Niebuhr, Norman Holmes Pearson, Paul Ramsey, John E. Smith, Thomas Schafer, and Amos N. Wilder. The editors intend to republish not only Edwards' printed works but also the manuscript materials, and they have clearly established editorial principles for the edition; so that "a clear and fair exhibition" of Edwards' thought has begun. The project started with the support of the Bollingen Foundation, and funds are available for the several volumes of the "Miscellanies" now being edited by Thomas Schafer. But, a member of the editorial committee notes, "the financing of the remainder of the edition is not now in hand."

Of the editorial enterprises with work to show for their efforts, Joseph J. Rubin's "Monument Edition" of the twelve novels of John William DeForest is the most striking, in that Professor Rubin has edited, introduced, printed, bound, shipped, and sold good editions of *Honest John Vane* (1960) and *Playing the Mischief* (1961) from his Bald Eagle Press at State College, Pennsylvania. He is currently preparing a third of DeForest's major novels, *Kate Beaumont*, for publication. The costs of printing and publishing for a lone operator without any sort of subsidy are great, however, especially if his standards of production are high; and the future of Professor Rubin's bold venture is therefore very uncertain.

The balance sheet to this point is as follows. Complete, admirably-edited editions of Lanier and Dickinson are available. The Hendricks edition of Melville is stalled, and a complete edition *de novo* is under consideration. The New York University edition of Whitman (except perhaps for the barest scraps and fragments), the Ohio State University Press edition of Hawthorne (not yet complete in what is planned for inclusion), and the Yale University Press Edwards are reasonably certain of full publication, though the middle and last volumes may come slowly. The "Monument Edition" of DeForest is in serious straits.

Editions Planned

No American writer, not even Emily Dickinson, suffered such defacing of his text and maligning of his character after his death as Edgar A. Poe, but the efforts of several generations of scholars have now come near to redressing these wrongs. The poems and letters of Poe have been well edited, by Killis Campbell and J. W. Os-

trom; the canon of the stories, reviews and criticism, and journalistic pieces has been so well established by Thomas O. Mabbott, Charles F. Heartman and Kenneth Rede, John W. Robertson, and others as to make possible a new and complete *Works*. Professor Mabbott, who planned such a *Works* thirty-five years ago after discussions with Professor Campbell, is now editor of *The Complete Works of Poe*, to be published in 8 volumes by Harvard University Press. The first volume, of poems, is now being set. Final authorized versions will form the basis of text of poems and tales. Earliest versions of poems that differ greatly from last versions will be reprinted in full, and intermediate changes will be recorded as variant readings. Professor Mabbott, who is now retired but engaged in teaching, will need subvention to complete the edition; and, we assume, he will also wish help from other skilled and devoted Poe scholars, as he and his publisher may agree.

Two major coordinated editions of the writings of S. L. Clemens, Mark Twain, are in process. The first of these in 12 volumes will bring into print everything of interest that remains in the unpublished Mark Twain Papers and other collections of Mark Twain manuscripts. Henry Nash Smith, Walter Blair, and Donald Coney constitute the Editorial Board, Frederick Anderson the Associate Editor to the Board, of the *Papers*, and the University of California Press is the publisher. The second, of 24 volumes, *The Manuscript Edition of the Works of Mark Twain*, will include more of Mark Twain's printed writings than any previous edition, with the intent of presenting clear text taking into account all manuscript readings where manuscript exists. John C. Gerber, chairman, and Paul Baender, Walter Blair, and William M. Gibson are the editorial board for Harper & Row, the publishers. Editors of individual volumes include Leon T. Dickinson, Roger Asselineau, Gladys Bellamy, Frederick Anderson, Hamlin Hill, Roger Salamon, James D. Williams, Louis J. Budd, Paul Fatout, Franklin Rogers, Hennig Cohen, Arlin Turner, Albert E. Stone, Edgar M. Branch, Howard Baetzhold, Lewis Leary, and the members of the editorial board. Guide lines for establishing and handling text and for the format of individual volumes have been agreed upon. Plans call for publishing four volumes at a time. The publishers have agreed to pay a small portion of pre-publication editorial cost; but the rate at which this edition will appear will depend upon time and funds squeezed out by each editor. The problem will be even more acute for the editors of the University of California Press *Papers*, because their editing from photo-copy of manuscripts must be completed by sustained work with the original manuscripts, in Berkeley and elsewhere. One feature of the Berkeley and the Harper & Row editions deserves remark. Though they are separate editions separately financed, they will not duplicate any of Mark Twain's writings, and they will appear in harmonious if not identical type faces and formats and bindings. Jacob Blanck has tentatively agreed to round off the coordinated editions with a refined and enlarged bibliography.

Conferences of interested scholars at the last five annual meetings of the Modern Language Association have resulted in a plan to publish the manuscripts of Washington Irving, under an editorial board consisting of Lewis Leary, chairman, Walter Reichert, Andrew B. Myers, Henry A. Pochmann, and Richard Beale Davis, with Herbert Kleinfeld as managing editor. The board envisions 5 volumes of journals and perhaps 13 of letters, 18 in all. Under a grant from the American Philosophical Society, Professor Kleinfeld is completing the finding list on which the edition must be based. Under Professor Pochmann's direction, Nathalia Wright has begun work on volume I of the journals, Walter Reichert has nearly completed volume II (the French and German journals), and John F. McDermott is undertaking volume V (the western journals, 1832–42). Joseph F. Ballew, working with Professor Davis, is gathering letters. "We have not yet faced up to an edition of Irving's writings," one of the editors has said, "but will get a volume or two of journals ready and then talk with publishers." The facilities of Sleepy Hollow Restorations are available to the editors, with the cooperation of Robert Wheeler, research director; but no financial support for the edition has yet been secured beyond what the editors have been able to find as individuals.

Edd Winfield Parks, Louis D. Rubin, Jr., Arlin Turner, Randall Stewart, Donald Davidson, and Mary C. Simms Oliphant, with James B. Meriwether as bibliographical advisor, constitute an editorial committee now considering an edition of the writings of William Gilmore Simms. Their first goal is a reliable and inclusive list of Simms's published works and a census of extant manuscripts. The committee begins with three distinct advantages: the 5 volume *Letters of William Gilmore Simms* which Mrs. Oliphant, Alfred T. Odell, and T. C. Duncan Eaves edited for the University of North Carolina Press from 1952 to 1956, the great collection of Simms in

the University of South Carolina library, and the thoroughly-informed support of Mrs. Oliphant, Simms's granddaughter. The committee also faces two ponderous obstacles. Can they select and publish some 15 volumes of the best of Simms's work, and edit the remainder on microcards? And can they secure a subsidy of about $3,000 per volume for publication by the Louisiana State University Press, quite aside from finding support for the editors?

Desirable Editions

At this point one might expect scholars, critics, librarians, bibliophiles, publishers, backers of local writers, and mere habitual readers to split into twenty groups, or even units of one; and they do, to a degree. Even so, as far as the informal survey conducted by the present writers has gone, though academic and non-academic readers disagree or choose differently among twentieth-century writers, the group agrees remarkably on those major American authors of the nineteenth century who ought to be published fully and accurately. The committee on priorities headed by Henry Nash Smith at the Conference on Editions of October 1962 named Hawthorne, Poe, Whitman, Mark Twain, Melville, Emerson, Thoreau, and James in the nineteenth century, and with less unanimity still could agree that Eliot, Faulkner, Frost, Hemingway, O'Neill, and Stevens might justly be called major writers of the twentieth century—all fourteen worth full and fine editions. Here the weight of opinion of the scholars who responded to the Cady-Gibson questionnaire must be recognized, for the respondents generally recommended that the twentieth century writers ought to give way in priority to such writers as Edward Taylor, Cooper, Longfellow, Henry Adams, Howells, and Stephen Crane. They urged that the publishing houses that Frost and Faulkner and Hemingway helped to make famous ought to bear the primary responsibility of making their full accomplishment available, with the help of such experts as they might enlist. With this view we are now in agreement. Scholars in the field ought, we believe, to turn their efforts first to editing the important American writers of the past.

Of these worthies, R. W. Emerson stands close to the center. The student of Emerson is relatively well off, because the *Complete Works* of 1904 was well-edited by earlier standards, and the *Journals* of 1909–1914, though they may be less reliable, adequately represent the originals. Ralph L. Rusk's *Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, 6 volumes published in 1939, presented Emerson's text for the first time definitively, though it simply listed without including such letters as *The Correspondence of Thomas Carlyle and Ralph Waldo Emerson*, unreprinted since the original editions of 1883 and 1886. Elinor Tilton's edition of the letters Professor Rusk excluded will presumably remedy this lack. *The Early Lectures of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, begun by Robert E. Spiller and Stephen Whicher before Professor Whicher's death, enlarges both the canon and the area of reliable text. Further, *The Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, under William H. Gilman, Alfred Ferguson, Merrell E. Davis (now deceased), Merton M. Sealts, and Harrison Hayford, will when complete in some 16 volumes provide readers with a reliable large segment of Emerson's writings. Harvard University Press has published two volumes to date, and with the Emerson Memorial Association has made a limited contribution toward research and editorial costs. Still, the larger portion of the editorial costs of these two major editions has been borne by the individual editors, and under present arrangements the future rate of publication will be slow. More work on Emerson's text remains to be done, including the publication of most of his sermons.

E. B. White's profoundly intuitive essays on Henry D. Thoreau, Carl Bode's *Collected Poems* of 1943, Walter Harding and Carl Bode's *The Correspondence* of 1958, J. Lyndon Shanley's brilliant genetic study *The Making of Walden, with the Text of the First Version* of 1957, Perry Miller's edition of the missing manuscript Journal, *Consciousness in Concord* of 1958, the focus provided by the Thoreau Society—all these point toward an all-inclusive edition that would gather uncollected essays, re-edit and complete the Journal, print the Indian notebooks in full, and include certain newly-discovered poems and letters. Wide and increasing interest in Thoreau here and in Europe and Asia would justify such an edition. A great deal of spadework has been done, and the requisite knowledge and skill are available.

A collected edition of everything that Henry James wrote is probably not possible now, and it may never be possible until the day—it seems far off—when students of James agree on the "best" versions of his much-revised stories and novels. In different stories, the choice of copy-text might run from manuscript, to magazine version, to first edition, to revised editions, to the finally revised text of the New York edition. In the meanwhile, Charles Scribner's Sons is

bringing out the New York edition again by photo-offset printing. J. B. Lippincott and Rupert Hart-Davis on either side of the Atlantic are well along with Leon Edel's *The Complete Tales of Henry James*, to be completed in 12 volumes, in which original book publications provide the editor's choice of text. Professor Edel, who edited *The Complete Plays of Henry James* in 1949, will publish a 5-volume *Letters* with Harvard University Press, exclusive of the correspondence with William James and with Howells, which will appear as separate volumes. Much excellent work has been done on James's textual revisions; much remains to be done. Until a complete edition becomes feasible, a calendar of James's entire correspondence would be useful, and a collection of James's criticism—all of it—would be illuminating. Professor Edel and Dan H. Laurence's *A Bibliography of Henry James*, brought out by Rupert Hart-Davis in 1957, makes such a collection possible.

Interest in the novels of James Fenimore Cooper remains high in Europe and the Soviet Union and is rising slowly again in the United States. Whether all the fiction can be published again from the best nineteenth-century editions and from manuscript remains a question. Because Cooper was a more careful workman than is commonly thought and revised his novels rather often, in proof, at times drastically, the editorial task would be formidable. Other segments of Cooper's writing, however, should be published, or republished. James F. Beard, Cooper's literary executor, expects to finish his impressive edition of *The Letters and Journals of James Fenimore Cooper* for the Belknap Press of Harvard University Press in two years. Two volumes appeared in 1960; four more are to come. Robert E. Spiller's recommendation, made many years ago, of an edition of Cooper's critical writings would represent another step toward completeness.

Only the broken column of 6 volumes (including eight books) of *The Writings of W. D. Howells* remains to indicate the never-finished Library Edition which Harper & Brothers began to publish in 1911, and these six volumes are scarce. Only six of Howells' novels are in print. Aside from Clara and Rudolf Kirk's *Criticism and Fiction and Other Essays*, published by New York University Press in 1959, and *Prefaces to Contemporaries*, which George Arms and Frederic C. Marston, Jr., edited in a small edition in 1957 for Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, the bulk of Howells' influential criticism is uncollected from the periodicals. Professors Arms and Marston are nearing completion of their calendar of the Howells correspondence, which they intend to follow up with perhaps 3 volumes of the literary letters; but (familiar refrain) time for the work is limited. A bright spot is Walter Meserve's *The Complete Plays of W. D. Howells*, published by New York University Press in 1960. The groundwork for editing other portions of Howells' writings, such as the complete criticism, or the poems or travel books, or an open-ended series of the novels has been laid by William M. Gibson and Professor Arms' *A Bibliography of William Dean Howells*, New York Public Library, 1948, and John K. Reeves's "The Literary Manuscripts of W. D. Howells, A Descriptive Finding List," which appeared in the *New York Public Library Bulletin* in 1958 and 1961.

The need for full editions of Cooper and Howells is certainly less pressing than the need for a complete Melville, but this does not mean that interested scholars ought not to press forward on all three fronts. The case for Stephen Crane is similar. Since Alfred A. Knopf published their handsome *The Work of Stephen Crane* in 12 volumes in 1925–26 under Wilson Follett's editorship, interest in Crane has mounted to such a degree that Russell & Russell, Inc., have recently announced that they will reprint the Knopf edition by photo-offset, in 12 volumes bound as six. R. W. Stallman and Lillian Gilkes' *Stephen Crane: Letters* (1960) and Professor Stallman's forthcoming collection of *Sketches and War Despatches*, both from New York University Press, add wholly new writing to *The Work*, just as Dan G. Hoffman's *The Poetry of Stephen Crane* (Columbia University Press, 1957) contributes fourteen previously unpublished poems. Manuscript materials have been assembled in the Columbia University Libraries and the C. Waller Barrett collection of the University of Virginia Library. Ames W. Williams and Vincent Starrett's *Stephen Crane, A Bibliography*, published by John Valentine in 1948, identifies nearly all of Crane's periodical publications. A *complete* writings of Crane seems appropriate at a time when certain of the dramatic news-stories crumble every time a rare newspaper-file is used.

Other Desirable Editions

Here our preliminary survey branches out so widely that we may only touch on projects and plans and desiderata. Perry Miller has edited the *Complete Writings of Roger Williams* in a seven-volume edition soon to be published by Russell & Russell, Inc. A uniform edition of the extant poems, sermons, and other manuscripts of Ed-

ward Taylor would now become possible because of the previous publications and the editorial skill of Thomas H. Johnson, Norman Grabo, and Donald E. Stanford. The case for a sound edition of Henry Adams' letters, fiction, biography, and historical theory is obviously strong. Many scholars believe that a complete edition of Longfellow's poems might properly restore to him the name of poet. Editions of William Bradford, Anne Bradstreet, John Wise, and William Byrd, and their successors, Freneau, C. B. Brown, Bryant, Whittier, Holmes, and Lowell, ought to be undertaken. And to suggest only two writers of the twentieth century, Robinson and Dreiser might now be collected because of the present state of bibliographical and biographical knowledge concerning them, the published letters, and the availability of manuscript materials.

A Few Observations

Even this rapid census, errors and omissions acknowledged, leads to the conclusion that the American scholar, while settling Hoti's business, has at times been negligent of the immense, soundless dialogue that goes on in the nation between American writers of the past and the single attentive responding reader. Though he disavows chauvinism because he is a scholar and is interested in all living literatures, he has yet put the phrase "the usable truth" into Melville's mouth, when Melville actually said "the visible truth"—not that Melville's handwriting is not excessively hard to decipher. He has largely forgotten to remind the reader of Kate Chopin's quietly narrated love-tragedy, *The Awakening*, or Whittier's "lifelike picture of the past" in the very accents of the past, *Leaves from Margaret Smith's Journal*, or Roger Williams' rough-voiced, impassioned, truth-seeking letters. He is only now learning how, in *The Mysterious Stranger*, a literary executor soon after Mark Twain's death decided what Mark Twain might not say to that reader, and even how to say what he permitted him. But the scholar or editor or "entomological critic," as Melville called him in a moment of frustration with his proofs, serves an irreplaceable function in the dialogue, especially as the distance in time increases between speaker and listener. If he is competent, he keeps all the speech of a master-writer current; he keeps the words clear and undistorted; and with fine tact, he translates when translation is necessary.

To drop the metaphor, interpreters of American literature have an obligation, when they turn editors, to make the whole writings of major American writers *as these artists intended them for their public* available to any reader who will go to a good library; perhaps beyond that, to any reader who will buy an inexpensive book that stems from the complete edition. There is every indication that editors are now competent and numerous enough to repair the textual neglect suffered by Edwards and Poe and Hawthorne and Whitman and the others. The writers of America, said Melville, "are not so many in number as to exhaust her good will."

Practical questions of course abound. Time in the form of money has come to editors in the past, and still comes from university research funds, sabbatical leave, Fulbright research grants, the American Philosophical Society, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Guggenheim Foundation, giving less time to students, shaving the private or family budget, and other sources. Can directors of funds beyond these groups be convinced of the need for supporting the scholar-editor? Supposing the rock gushes forth a stream of grants, how vigorously and efficiently will editors react to the opportunity? And how early might grants be accepted in the academic world of swelling enrollments and increasing demands for vigorous experienced teachers? Can present and potential editors agree on the need for fine readable type-faces, paper that will last three centuries, simple but durable and handsome covers? Can the right and full texts, once established, be made widely available so that students and readers in the United States and abroad can buy them?

Suppose many of the public, school, and university libraries of the United States and all the chief United States Information Service libraries abroad had on their shelves good complete editions of fifteen American literary masters. What then? We venture one prediction. American readers of these texts would know more clearly than ever before "the curious fate" of being an American. Readers abroad would come to understand more discriminatingly and to respect more justly the country that bred such men.

New York University
New York 3
Indiana University
Bloomington

THE 1962 SUMMER INSTITUTES OF THE COMMISSION ON ENGLISH: THEIR ACHIEVEMENT AND PROMISE

By John C. Gerber

OF THE MANY enterprises undertaken during the last few years to upgrade the teaching of English, the 1962 Summer Institute Program sponsored by the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board has been the most dramatic and, in many ways, the most promising. Already it is clear that the effects of this program are being felt in many high-school classes, and that the formula devised by the Commission on English is being copied widely and successfully. The potential usefulness of such Institutes for the advanced training of high-school English teachers, therefore, has already been demonstrated. What makes these Institutes of especial significance to MLA members, however, is that the program required twenty of the most influential Departments of English in the country to involve themselves *directly* in this advanced training of high-school teachers. These were not institutes conducted by professors of Education with the casual blessing of Departments of English; these were institutes administered and largely taught by professors of English. The difference is a very great one indeed. Whether we like it or not, the CEEB Institutes have, in effect, forced those of us in Departments of English to acknowledge a substantial responsibility for improving the quality of English teaching in the high schools. Because of them—and of such subsequent activities as the Allerton Conference and the Curriculum Centers—a new appraisal of our proper professional functions has been quietly taking place on one campus after another. Even now it is no exaggeration to say, I believe, that a Department of English may no longer claim to be of the top rank unless it includes among its programs one or more designed to aid the high-school English teacher, both the tenderfoot and the old-timer.

The purpose of this paper, however, is not to explore the implications of these reappraisals that are taking place, but to examine the Institutes that were so influential in initiating them. What were they? How good were they? What should be done to make future institutes better? These are some of the questions to which this report will address itself.

Since I had nothing to do with the organization or operation of the Institutes, I should probably explain at the outset why I have been asked to write this paper. Just before the Institutes opened in the summer of 1962, twelve of us were commissioned by the Office of Education to make an independent evaluation of them.[1] What the Office of Education wanted to know was whether these Institutes were activities worth the investment of federal funds. In addition, the Office hoped to be able to publish a report that would be useful for those sponsoring future institutes, whether they were federally supported or not. As a result, the twelve of us, traveling singly, visited all but one of the twenty Institutes at least twice, the normal visit being for the full school week of five days.

The Institute staffs gave us complete freedom to attend their classes, interview their participants, and talk with their colleagues and administrators. Later, principally in January and February of 1963, we visited the classrooms of 64 of the 868 Institute participants, the 64 being selected to represent Institutes; geographical sections; large and small, urban and rural, and public and parochial high schools. In evaluating the Institutes and their immediate impact upon the teaching of the participants, we have employed over two hundred criteria grouped under such headings as aims, staff, participants, curriculum, tests, schedules, and physical arrangements. The complete and final report of our study will shortly be made to the Office of Education, and presumably will then be made public by that agency in the form of a monograph. What follows, after a brief description of the Institutes, is a condensed version of our evaluation.

Some Facts about the Institutes

The prime desire of the Commission on English was to upgrade the teaching of English in the

[1] The twelve Evaluators included William P. Albrecht (Univ. of Kansas), Dwight L. Burton (Florida State Univ.), Leon T. Dickinson (Missouri Univ.), Frederick L. Gwynn (Trinity Coll.), Sumner Ives (Syracuse Univ.), John E. Jordan (Univ. of California, Berkeley), John C. McGalliard (Univ. of Iowa), Lorietta Scheerer, (Redondo Beach H.S., Redondo Beach, Calif.), Eugene E. Slaughter (Southeastern State Coll., Durant, Okla.), Donald R. Tuttle (U. S. Office of Education), Rosemary Wilson (School District of Philadelphia), and John C. Gerber (Univ. of Iowa), Chairman. John McLaughlin (Univ. of Iowa) helped with the follow-up visits.

nation's secondary schools, especially the teaching of English to students intending to go to college. More specifically, it hoped (1) to improve the academic preparation of nine hundred carefully selected teachers of English, (2) to amass samples of excellent teaching materials appropriate for college preparatory classes in grades 9–12, (3) to engage university faculties more actively and more realistically in teacher training, and (4) to prove the feasibility of similar institutes, supported by grants from foundations or from the Federal government, beginning in 1963.

Since the Commission hoped to reinvigorate the teaching of English on a national scale, it invited Departments of English in twenty universities from coast to coast to act as hosts for the Institutes. The first twenty to be invited accepted: Cornell, Duke, Harvard, Indiana, Michigan, Nevada, New York University, Ohio State, Penn State, Pittsburgh, Rutgers, St. Louis, Southern Illinois, Stanford, State University of New York at Albany, Texas, Tulane, UCLA, Washington, and Wisconsin. With the exception of the plains states and the Rocky Mountain states, nearly every section in the country was represented. Each Institute enrolled a maximum of 45 participants who presumably lived within 50 miles of the campus. Fifty miles for some of the Institutes, however, was an elastic distance. Those in charge at Nevada, for example, happily discovered that a circle with a 50-mile radius drawn around Reno included both Alaska and Hawaii. In the selection of participants, Institute staffs used criteria recommended by the Commission. According to these criteria, the participant was to be a person who had the equivalent in subject-matter courses of a full or nearly full undergraduate major in English with an academic record that promised success in graduate study, who had taught for at least three years, who planned to teach for at least ten more, and who was teaching mostly college-preparatory students in a school where a substantial percentage of the graduates go on to college. In addition, he was to have a promise from his administrative superior of freedom to experiment in his classes during the year following the Institute. Each applicant who was accepted received tuition and a stipend of $350, the money coming from the College Entrance Board with supplements from the Bing Fund, the Danforth Foundation, the Hobby Foundation, the Old Dominion Foundation, and the Victoria Foundation, Inc. The cost to the College Board alone was well over half a million dollars.

The curriculum was hammered out at a planning session held in the summer of 1961 under the direction of Floyd Rinker and his associates on the Commission. Those in charge of the major sections at this session were Helen C. White (literature), W. Nelson Francis (language), and Albert R. Kitzhaber (composition). Out of this conference came the general format and the syllabi that were followed at all Institutes, even though the Institutes were administered independently.

Normally, Institute classes met every school day for either six or eight weeks, depending upon the length of the university's summer session. At most Institutes a workshop was scheduled for two or three afternoons a week, though at Harvard the whole sixth week was set aside for it. At Michigan an optional workshop was offered during the last two weeks. The host university awarded graduate credit varying from five to twelve hours, depending upon local decisions and practices.

To be of continuing service to the participants and to evaluate the immediate impact of its Institute, each host university released one staff member half-time during the fall term, 1962–63, to visit the high school classes of every participant. In his visits this instructor tried particularly to see what use was being made of the ideas and practices learned in the Institute, how useful the workshop materials were proving to be, and to what extent the participant was sharing with his colleagues the concepts and materials he had gained in the Institute. To evaluate its program, the Commission on English will use the reports of these follow-up visits, reports from the Directors of the Institutes, the results of diagnostic and final tests, and whatever other data it can assemble. The Commission promises that its final report will appear early in 1964.

Aims

For the most part, the four specific objectives of the Commission on English made excellent sense. They were succinctly stated, few in number, and not so visionary as to be unrealizable. They were clearly means toward that broader aim to upgrade the teaching of English in our nation's schools. What is more, they were objectives that a majority of the participants enthusiastically accepted. Only a small minority said that they did not approve of the aims or did not know what they were.

The first aim—to improve the academic preparation and teaching skills of the participants—was the crucial objective, or more accurately, the

crucial objectives since two matters were involved. Although those who planned the Institutes may have blurred their intent somewhat by compressing two aims into one statement, they showed only the highest vision in adopting both. By so doing, they set the program apart from a normal graduate program in English in which there would have been little interest in the participant as a teacher, and from the usual summer workshops in which there would have been little attention to the participant as a cultivated human being. In essence, their proposal was that the Institute Program was to be at once theoretical and practical, academic and vocational, personal and professional. More than this, through means built into the program, the planners proposed to interrelate these complementary ends. This broad concept of the function of the Institutes was both sound and imaginative. If it was also overambitious, in the sense that the planners expected that the participants would *greatly* improve their academic preparation and their teaching skills in a single summer session, the error was at least on the side of the angels.

There is no doubt that the improvement in both areas was substantial. The papers, the tests, and the observations of the Institute staffs and of our own group of Evaluators all testify to this. As a whole, the Institutes were especially successful in contributing to the intellectual growth of the participants. Even the participants sensed this, for their collective judgment was that the Institutes had contributed to their intellectual growth "greatly" but to their skill as teachers only "moderately." Despite this imbalance, both objectives should definitely be retained by those planning future institutes. Not to include them would be to lose the scope, the comprehensiveness, and, indeed, the great source of vitality of the 1962 Institutes.

The second aim—to amass samples of excellent teaching materials—is one that might be profitably eliminated as an objective for future institutes. The Commission had a special and laudable aim—to collect materials that could be duplicated and passed out to English teachers across the country so that the happy consequences of the twenty Institutes could be many times multiplied. In some respects it must be admitted that the effects of this aim upon the Institutes was salutary. It caused Institute staffs to give sober thought to their workshops, the one feature that many staff members would have preferred to forget. It motivated the participants to a level of activity that they probably would not otherwise have achieved. (Many of them felt obligated to turn out teaching materials as a kind of *quid pro quo* for their $350 stipend.) It forced conferences between instructors and participants, and it led to useful discussions among participants themselves. At best it resulted in individual and group projects of some freshness and promise. And, of course, there was the desired flow of materials to the Commission office.

Nevertheless, these results were achieved at a considerable cost. The pressure to produce for an unknown audience created tension among the participants. There was some uncertainty about what the Commission wanted; there was fear lest the local Institute not show up well compared with other Institutes; there was a tendency to stress quantity instead of quality, the impressively broad project instead of the finely focused one. What seemed most regrettable, however, was the general reluctance to use the workshops for a discussion of points that had come up in the courses, for a sharing of ideas, for a questioning of methods. Instead, there seemed to be the feeling that one should constantly be doing something that would lead to mimeographed sheets. At worst, this feeling led to a frenetic busy-ness that sapped the students' vitality and caused them to skimp their course assignments.

The third objective was to engage university faculties more actively in teacher training. It would be incorrect to say that all of the Institutes failed in attempting to achieve this aim because some of them did not really attempt it. And certainly most of them did not achieve it in an immediate and clearly apparent way. Very few of the English departments involved seemed, at the time, to consider the Institutes an important departmental enterprise. In five departments even the chairman seemed indifferent. Occasionally our Evaluators encountered members of English departments who were not even aware of the presence of an Institute on their campus. Quite obviously, few of the twenty departments involved had made the Institutes a matter of departmental business in which the entire department voted to grant graduate credit for Institute work and therefore felt some responsibility for its success.

Yet there were encouraging developments. Those members of English departments who taught in the Institutes developed a tremendous enthusiasm for the project. Some experienced almost an epiphany, a realization that an English professor can successfully engage in something related to teacher training. This realization is bound to spread. The interest in teacher training indicated in December 1962 at the Allerton

House conference of some eighty chairmen of Departments of English was certainly due in part to the Institutes. And the fact that over twenty other institutes have subsequently been planned and administered by Departments of English rather than by Schools of Education indicates that the 1962 Institutes piqued the curiosity of English faculties more than our Evaluators could detect during their 1962 visits. Best of all, perhaps, the Institutes in many instances managed to get professors in English and Education talking and planning together, both during and since the summer of 1962. In short, the third objective is a valuable one which is well worth retaining by future institute planners.

The fourth and last aim—to prove the feasibility of similar institutes, supported by grants from foundations or from the Federal government, beginning in 1963—needs no extended comment. Clearly, the 1962 Institutes merit imitation. Combining the theoretical and practical and bringing into play the three disciplines with which every English teacher must deal, the format is comprehensive and yet reasonably well focused. For both staff and participants, the work load was demanding but not necessarily backbreaking. And it was clear that the stipend of $350 plus remission of tuition was generous enough to attract a great many teachers. But it was not clear that it was sufficiently generous to attract the highly influential kind of teacher that the Commission most hoped to reach. Thirteen Institutes did not fill their quota of 45, although most of these had 43 or 44. Only a few Institutes had applications in sufficient number to allow some precision in selecting the kind of teacher wanted.

Without a doubt, the Commission demonstrated that it has an appealing and useful format for a summer program. If those planning future institutes are willing to accept such teachers as apply, they may fill their quota with the offer of a modest stipend or, indeed, with the offer of no stipend at all. But if they are trying to reach the most influential teachers in their area, they will need to provide a stipend sufficient to cover all living costs. Applications for grants to foundations or to the Federal government should be made out with this warning in mind.

Staff

The blueprint for an Institute staff called for a Director, three course instructors, a workshop supervisor, and a follow-up instructor who would give half-time in the fall to visiting participants in their classes. In no Institute, however, did such a blueprint result in the assignment of six different men to Institute service. Fourteen of the Directors, for example, also taught a course; and only two Institutes had workshop supervisors who were not also Directors or course instructors. Also, in almost all Institutes the follow-up instructor had been a Director or a course instructor.

The Director. Among other duties, each Director was responsible for planning his own Institute within the guidelines laid down at the 1961 planning session, overseeing its operation, taking care of physical arrangements, and briefing the staff and participants on objectives, procedures, and activities. In all Institutes the Director was a member of the Department of English of the host university. Seventeen had no classes outside the Institute though they were on call for thesis reading, committee work, and other departmental chores. Fourteen, as mentioned above, taught a class in the Institute. Only six had had teaching experience at the high-school level.

As a group, the Directors were both able and dedicated. They worked hard and earnestly, and the Institutes ran with a considerable degree of efficiency. Falterings in operation were by no means always attributable to the Director. In several instances the Director had not been granted authority consistent with his responsibility. Even the participants in one Institute noticed that the real head of the Institute was the head of the English Department. Some Directors were overworked and could not give sufficient time to the Institute because the departments asked too much of them. Some of those who taught as well as directed found that the course demanded so much of them that administrative details had to be neglected. Many had too little clerical help.

There were lapses in operation, however, that were manifestly due to Directors. Two or three of them simply disliked administrative detail and slighted it. Many failed to brief the instructional staff and the participants sufficiently on aims, procedures, and coming events. The most serious lapse in this regard was that almost all of the Directors failed to emphasize at the very beginning that the courses were to operate as regular graduate courses and would not deal with teaching methods, that methodology would be considered only in the workshop. This point needed to be hammered home with the utmost force since the brochure had blurred it somewhat in crowding the two major objectives into one statement. But it especially needed to be hammered upon because, through past experience, the par-

ticipants had come to *expect* that summer workshops and institutes in English would deal extensively with methodology. On almost every campus there was some confusion and resentment concerning what the courses should be doing. While the instructor kept to the content of the course, many of the participants sat restively in their seats waiting for suggestions about teaching techniques. Any amount of silly and wasteful grumbling could have been avoided had the Directors made it crystal clear in the first days that the courses were not to be concerned with methodology.

Possibly the most serious lapse of the Directors was that they failed, on most campuses, to coordinate the assignments in the three courses with one another and with the projects in the workshops. Too often the participants were subjected to a barrage of uncoordinated assignments that even the most conscientious student could not handle successfully. Over two-thirds of the participants complained that their work load was "too heavy" or "much too heavy." The complaint was not a captious one.

In the best run Institutes—and there were four that were superbly run—the Director was a talented scholar and an able administrator; he was friendly and informal, both with his staff and the participants; he had authority consistent with his responsibilities; he was freed by his department of almost all obligations except the Institute; he attended the classes frequently; he had regular meetings with his staff; and he had at least a half-time secretary. Whether he taught a course or not seemed not to make much difference. Nor did it seem essential for the Director to have had teaching experience at the high-school level so long as he had some familiarity with high-school curricula and a sympathetic understanding of the high-school teachers' attitudes. To be successful, a Director did not have to be a demigod, but he did have to be a capable man who was willing to dedicate all of his abilities for the time being to the Institute.

Instructors. The instructional staffs were normally selected by the chairman of the Department of English, usually but not always with the advice of the Director. All but seven of the instructional staffs had at least one member who was an extramural appointment. The great majority of the instructors were members of Departments of English. Four, however, were English-Education specialists, and four were high-school teachers. Sixteen of the university faculty members, at one time or another, had had teaching experience in high school.

Plainly, the instructors were chosen with care. Many of them were among the best-known members of the profession; all of them had either a national or a local reputation for their contributions to the profession, either in teaching or in publication or in both. What is more, the instructors were unusually motivated to do a good job. They had met together in Ann Arbor in the summer of 1961 and there had agreed on the courses they would teach; they had had a full year in which to perfect the courses; and they knew that their work would be observed and evaluated by the CEEB Commission on English. In the light of all this, it is not surprising that the teaching in the Institutes, taken as a whole, was a cut or two above university teaching generally. What were especially impressive in the majority of classes were the freshness of the material, the careful organization of its presentation, the constant probing for student observations and reactions, the helpful use of the blackboard and mimeographed examples, and the friendly rapport between instructor and class. Much of the teaching in the Institutes was just about as effective as teaching can be, given a class of 45 and a hot summer. Interestingly, the teaching did not seem noticeably more effective in those classes which were divided in half so that the instructor faced 22 instead of 45.

But as exciting as some classes were, others were only tolerable, and a few were downright dull. Roughly a third of the instructors seemed only average or below average as teachers, including some who had scholarly and pedagogical publications of considerable distinction to their credit. Many of the weaknesses were the ordinary ones: too high a level of generalization, wordiness, irrelevance, an inability or a disinclination to solicit ideas from the participants, too little use of visual aids, and a disheartening lack of direction. A weakness specific to the teaching in the Institutes was a failure to adapt to the level of the participants. In some instances (especially in the Composition course), the instructor irritated the participants by grossly underrating their capabilities; in other instances (especially in the Language course), the instructor bewildered the participants by overrating them. In either case, there was a breakdown in rapport that seriously interfered with the learning process. More than a few participants complained that instructors were condescending toward them and were unavailable for consultation.

As one would expect, the most effective staffs were those in which all three members were both able scholars and forceful and imaginative teach-

ers. More than this, though, the most effective staffs were those in which all three members recognized the special sensitivities of the experienced English teachers they had as students and adjusted their teaching accordingly. It seemed to enhance a staff's effectiveness if one of the three instructors was from another campus and if one (possibly the same person) was either a high-school teacher or someone who knew high-school work intimately. What did not seem to make much difference were such matters as age, sex, years of experience, or bibliography. Liveliness was important, as were friendliness and a clear sense of dedication to the Institute and its participants. At the risk of stating the obvious, it should be said that no Institute can really prosper unless *all* of the instructors are topnotch. If these Institutes failed to live up to their sponsors' expectations, it was surely in part because the typical Institute had only two excellent teachers instead of three.

Workshop Supervisor. Only two Institutes had workshop supervisors who were not also serving as course instructors or Directors. In the others, workshop activities were supervised by the Director, by the Director and one or more of the instructors, or by one or more of the instructors. Sometimes it was hard to tell *who* was supervising a workshop. Participants needed more and better guidance than they received. There were too few supervising the workshops who understood both the philosophy of the Institutes and the day-to-day problems of the secondary-school teacher. It may have been the major weakness of the Institute staffs that they operated the workshops with their left hands.

The best directed workshop was one in which the supervisor had the workshop as his sole Institute responsibility. He set up a clear schedule of activities and met with the participants in a single group, in small groups, and individually. Since he taught in high school, he knew the practical problems faced by the participants; and since he had attended planning sessions and regularly attended summer staff sessions and Institute classes, he knew and was sympathetic with the aims of the Institute. It is hard to see how a successful workshop supervisor could do less and still fulfill his function. To those visiting the Institutes it became clear that, in many ways, a workshop supervisor is the key member of a staff. If there can be a paragon on a staff, it should be he.

The Follow-up Instructor. The functions of the follow-up instructor were "to help evaluate the effectiveness of the workshop materials and to help the teachers develop new materials for classroom use." In almost every instance he was the Director of an Institute or an instructor who had helped supervise the workshop. Our group of Evaluators, of course, did not observe any interviews between participants and CEEB follow-up instructors, but we did talk with about 50 participants who had already been visited by them. Our judgments are based, therefore, upon the testimony of these participants.

A few of them felt that their work had been substantially helped by the visits. The follow-up instructor, they said, had not only reinforced points made during the Institute but had suggested other techniques worth trying. Three or four were especially grateful because the follow-up instructor had talked to administrators, other teachers, and even the students. But most of the participants testified that although the visits were pleasant, they were not especially valuable. Their main contention was that the follow-up instructors did not know enough about high-school work to analyze their problems and make useful suggestions about techniques and materials. Two said explicitly, and a number intimated, that the visits were more useful to the follow-up instructor than to the participant since they enabled him finally to see what high-school teachers must face!

All of this indicates that the follow-up instructor must be something more than a friendly fellow who assures the high-school teacher that the university is still interested in him. He must know enough about the teaching of English in the high schools to be of some practical help. If possible, he should be the institute's workshop supervisor since only he can ordinarily be in a position to check on the specific ways in which the participant is carrying out the plans formulated in the institute.

The idea of a follow-up visit has sufficient merit to be retained by those sponsoring other institutes. But unless two visits are planned, the one visit should not come so soon after the adjournment of the institute as the CEEB visits came. At least it should not come so soon if the purpose of the visit is to check on the impact of the institute. Participants cannot modify their own methods and courses in two or three months, let alone effect any important change in the curricula, courses, or materials of their colleagues or of their school system. Ideally, there should be at least two visits: one early in the fall after the institute to help the participant with his plans, the

other a year later to see how the plans are developing and to measure the effectiveness of workshop materials.

Participants

The Institutes hoped to enroll 900 and actually enrolled 868. Quantitatively, therefore, they did very well. Apparently, the most effective kind of publicity was a letter accompanied by a brochure sent to school boards, superintendents and principals, department heads, and, most importantly, to the English teachers themselves. When polled, 532 of the participants said they learned about the Institutes through letters and/or brochures sent to their home schools. Other sources of information prominently mentioned were: professional journals 84, newspapers 39, the National Council or state or local councils 34, other professional organizations 20, the College Entrance Board or Commission on English personnel 19.

Qualitatively the Institutes did well too. Every Institute had its screening committee consisting basically of the Institute Director and his staff. Additional members in some Institutes included such persons as the Summer Session director, the chairman of the Department of English, a representative of the state's Department of Education, and an authority on the high schools in the area. For purposes of screening, these committees required applicants to send in a completed application blank together with academic transcripts, letters of recommendation, and a statement by the proper administrative officer promising to give the applicant a free hand to experiment in his classes. Some committees even demanded an original essay. In addition to employing their own criteria in the screening process, each committee gave careful attention to the Commission's recommended requirements previously mentioned.

That these screening committees worked well is partly attested by the fact that only 14 of the participants who began the work of an Institute failed to finish it. From various statistics gathered by the Evaluators, the following "average" participant emerges: he was 39 years old; he had earned an A.B. degree and 16 hours of graduate credit; he had taught for eight years at the secondary level; he taught in a school enrolling about 1,000; he had classes in which about two-thirds of the students planned to go to college, though only 52% of the school's graduates actually went to college; he was a member of NCTE and one other professional organization; he had attended previous summer institutes or workshops; he had his administrator's promise, with some condition attached, that he might experiment in his classes during the year after the Institute. Such a profile indicates a mature and professionally-minded participant. And so most of them were. In class they appeared to be more perceptive than typical summer students, and much more interested in their academic program. In short, their abilities were considerable and their motivation high.

But generalizations about 868 participants fail to give the full picture. The differences were great, for the range was from the brilliant to the dull. And the differences among the Institute groups were great. In one Institute the participants were lively, articulate, and clearly eager to learn; in another not too many miles away they were subdued, relatively inarticulate, and occasionally antagonistic to learning. Some of the groups developed cohesion in the first week; one never did develop it. In summary, to our Evaluators one group seemed outstanding in almost every respect, eleven seemed willing and quite able, seven were only average, and one was relatively poor.

Why there should have been such marked differences in groups is a bit puzzling. From all that our Evaluators could gather, the twenty staffs applied the criteria for selection recommended by the Commission with comparable rigor. Geography seemed to make no difference; neither did the density of population of the area nor the incidence of commuting. The number and nature of the extra-curricular activities seemed not to be especially important either, though get-acquainted receptions were definitely helpful. Possibly there were three major causes for the differences. One was the number of applicants. The sifting committees that could select their groups of 45 from more than a hundred applications were able to assemble more promising groups than those that had to take almost everyone who applied in order to fill their rolls. A second cause for the differences probably lay in the leadership of the staff. Some Directors and instructors had the knack of getting their groups to work together enthusiastically; others either did not have the knack or did not try hard enough. A third cause surely lay in the personalities of the participants themselves. Several of the Institutes were simply lucky in drawing persons who worked together well and had a good time doing it. It is hard to see how this last condition can be deliberately planned, but the other two can. Through publicity, generous fellow-

ships, a distinctive program, a staff of national reputation, and wisely chosen criteria for selection, the sponsors of an institute should attempt to attract at least three or four times the number of applicants they can accept. Under such conditions, the participants selected are not only likely to be better academic risks, but they are also likely to be better motivated because they know they have survived a rigorous sifting process. Furthermore, the sponsors should select a Director who is not only intellectually but also temperamentally equipped for the position. He does not have to be a glad-hander, but he has to have a modest amount of energy and he *must* believe in the importance of high-school English and high-school English teachers. The reason for the failure of one CEEB group to work together successfully was quite obvious: the Director was too lofty.

Curriculum

The curriculum of the Institutes consisted of three courses—Literature, Language, Composition—and a workshop. The format won an overwhelming endorsement from both the staffs of the Institutes and the participants. And well it should have. It included graduate training in the three disciplines in which an English teacher must develop sophistication, and it provided an opportunity for the participants to translate this graduate training into the practical work of the high-school classroom. While there is a place for the more specialized institute—one, for instance, in linguistics alone—it is hard to see how the Commission on English format can be improved upon if one is attempting to provide a rounded training within a single summer session. Our Evaluators were unanimous and enthusiastic in approving the design of the curriculum. Whatever reservations they had were concerned with the operation of the several parts. The discussion that follows, therefore, will be of the three courses and the workshop considered separately.

The Literature Course. The aim of the Literature course was "to increase the teacher's knowledge of what is involved in the close reading of a literary work." To this aim the instructors closely adhered. Although extrinsic considerations occasionally entered informally into the class discussions, there was little or no formal attempt to include them. The classes in all Institutes followed the syllabus closely; they began with an examination of poetry and then moved to fiction and drama. Matters of primary interest were genre, point of view, structure, meaning, and mode. Subsidiary elements that received especial stress were imagery, figures, symbols, irony, paradox, diction, and syntax. There was much fruitful discussion in all twenty classes about what will "open up" a text for the reader so that he can read with greater pleasure and understanding.

The participants gave their overwhelming endorsement to this course. Of the 809 who responded to a poll taken toward the end of the session, 78% found the emphasis on close analysis "fully acceptable" or "acceptable"; 82% rated the organization and scope "excellent" or "good"; 81% thought the level of difficulty "about right"; 77% thought the course "extremely valuable" or "valuable" for their own education; and 58% rated its practical value for their own teaching either "extremely helpful" or "helpful." The 64 participants interviewed by our Evaluators in January and February 1963 were still enthusiastic about the course though only 45% said that it had actually been "extremely helpful" or "helpful" to them in their teaching of literature during the first semester of the school year.

There were many signs that the impact of the course was being felt in the classes taught by these participants, but possibly not so many signs as the Commission might have hoped for. Close to 60% reported that they had made no change in the organization of their work as a result of the course, though several in this group said that their courses were already organized for work in close analysis and a few others said that they planned to recommend changes when next their curriculum was up for study. Many pointed out that the effects of the course could best be seen not in any reorganization of their courses but in their stronger insistence upon careful reading. Yet here and there, organizational changes had already taken place. In order of frequency, the most important of these were a dropping or modifying of a strictly chronological organization in favor of the generic, more integration of the work in literature and composition, more use of contemporary literature, and a greater emphasis upon poetry. One participant said he was organizing the junior year around tragedy, and another mentioned that he was developing a seminar for ten gifted students.

When asked about materials used in their literature course, 58% said that they had made no changes, though four in this group remarked that they had previously been using the kind of texts recommended in the Institutes. In order of frequency, some of the changes mentioned were the introduction of primary works studied in the Institute course, the introduction of critical materials studied in the Institute, the addition of

more paperbacks (one participant persuaded his administrator to allocate $200 for books, chiefly paperbacks), the addition of more audio-visual aids, and a change in textbooks. What seemed most heartening was a discernible trend away from easy anthologies and "literature for adolescents" to more mature fiction, poetry, and drama.

About half of the 64 participants interviewed said that in classroom procedures they were spending more time having students analyze literary works in class, they were trying to ask more probing questions, they were giving more attention to the author's "voice" and to imagery, they were requiring more writing in class, and they were making greater use of panel discussions and oral reports. Many participants felt that the intellectual tone of their class work in literature had greatly improved.

Slightly less than half said they had made changes in their assignments in literature since returning from the Institute. In particular, they mentioned such changes as these: more assignments designed to elicit judgments rather than simply information, more assignments requiring criticism rather than description or biography, better focused assignments, more attention in book reports to matters of purpose and the means the author employs to achieve his purpose, and the use of assignments given them in the Institute course.

In short, what these follow-up interviews seemed to make clear was that about half of the participants were making no substantial attempt to change their teaching of literature because of their experiences at the Institutes. Yet it should be said that a sizable fraction of this group felt that no change was necessary because they had already been emphasizing what was stressed at the Institute. Others declared that they planned to make changes at a later date—and to recommend changes for their school system. So only about a fourth of the 64 participants interviewed seemed really to be resisting the methods and philosophy of the Institute course in literature, or to be indifferent to them. Many of these, however, felt that the course had been valuable for their own education. To put all of this more positively, a strong three-fourths of the participants during and after the Institutes felt that the Literature course was of great practical value to them.

They had good reasons for their enthusiasm. The direction of the course was clear; the works selected for reading and analysis were of the finest quality; and the teaching, while by no means uniformly excellent from Institute to Institute, was above the average for graduate classes. It is hard to see how *any* participant could have failed to discover new and important ways of reading a poem, a play, or a piece of fiction. The literature syllabus is one that might well be used as the basis for literature courses in future institutes.

Just a few modifications in the content and teaching of the course seem to merit suggestion. One is that critical approaches other than the analytical might profitably be discussed and illustrated with their various advantages and disadvantages defined. The implication was much too strong in some of the classes that close analysis is the only really acceptable critical approach. Another suggestion is that the course might profitably begin with fiction instead of poetry since secondary-school teachers tend to know more about fiction than poetry, and to be more knowledgeable and comfortable discussing it. As it stands, the course starts with the most esoteric instead of the most familiar material and, therefore, tends to be anticlimactic in effect, if not psychologically unsound in approach. A third suggestion is that there be more significant use of bibliographies and of critical works. Although participants were asked to read critical essays, too little was done in most classes to incorporate ideas from these readings into the thinking of the class. And not nearly enough was done to advertise bibliographical aids that the teachers could use in preparing their high-school materials. In short, valuable as they were, the instructors' personal *explications de texte* consumed too much of the class time. Finally, textbooks commonly employed in freshman and sophomore courses should not be used, for they tend to pull the course down to the undergraduate level.

The Language Course. The stated purposes of the Language course were (1) to make the teacher more aware of language as a field of study, (2) to show him the basic assumptions and methods of linguistics, and (3) to encourage him to undertake further study of linguistics and offer guidelines for that study. In order to accomplish these aims the linguistics instructors agreed upon a syllabus that identified five areas of study: the nature of language and how it can be studied, phonology, grammar, varieties of language and usage, and historical changes in usage. To the extent that these five areas were touched upon in all twenty Language courses, it can be said that the instructors followed the syllabus. But that is about all that can be said. The instructors gave their own emphases to the course, often had quite different

things to say about the new grammars, and employed their own teaching techniques, some of which were strikingly ingenious.

When polled toward the end of the Institute sessions, 64% of over 800 participants found the objectives of the course "fully acceptable" or "acceptable," 65% thought the organization of the course "excellent" or "good," 68% thought the level of difficulty "about right," and 63% thought the course "extremely valuable" or "valuable" for their own education. But only 35% thought it "extremely helpful" or "helpful" to them as teachers. Roughly two-thirds of the participants, therefore, approved of the course in most respects; the other third varied from those who were mildly displeased to those who actively resented it.

When our Evaluators interviewed 64 of these participants in January and February of 1963, well over two-thirds had kind things to say about the course. There was still a minority which complained that the course went so fast they could learn nothing well. Some felt that too much time had been spent on phonetics, that the course was disorganized, and that the instructor was too evangelical. Some were still downright resentful that the instructor had been so patronizing toward them because of their predilections for traditional grammar. But the great majority felt they had been given a broader and more accurate concept of what language really is. Those who previously had had some experience with structural or transformational grammar claimed that the course accelerated what one liked to call his "liberal tendencies." Many mentioned their gratitude for a sharper terminology, for excellent bibliographies, and for a stronger linguistic background. Most of those who still professed to be traditionalists were apologetic, maintaining that they were clinging to the old concepts only until they learned more about the new. A majority of the 64 interviewed said they planned to study more in the field, either by taking graduate courses or by reading on their own. One said the course so excited him that he might well specialize in linguistics. In short, these participants seemed to give the course a heart-warming endorsement.

When asked whether they had reorganized their courses in any respect as a result of attending the Institute classes, about 60% said that they had. They indicated such innovations as units on the history of the language, the levels of usage, etymology, dictionary study, and local dialects. Several said they were introducing elements of structural grammar into their courses; two, for example, said they were placing the stress on sentences instead of parts of speech. One was using phonemes in teaching spelling, another in teaching punctuation. One had developed a unit on the language structure of a poem; another had a series of lessons on the morphology in *1984*. Several were reorganizing their courses to accommodate them to Roberts' *Patterns of English*. And one somewhat dazed gentleman said that he had eliminated all the units in his course involving a study of traditional grammar, but he wasn't quite sure what he had put in their places. Most of these course changes were slight, but it was probably too much to expect general reorganizations the first year after the Institutes.

Two-thirds of the 64 students interviewed said they had introduced new linguistic materials into their courses as a result of the Institute. For example, they reported that they had added textbooks by Roberts or Sledd or Newsome. A great many were using the materials given them in their Institute classes (though these materials were not intended to be so used). Some had developed analogous materials and had had them mimeographed. A few exhibited workbooks on sentence structure, phonology, morphology, and syntax which they said they had persuaded the schools to buy. And two or three were having their schools purchase library books which had been listed on the bibliography distributed in the Institutes. One had managed to obtain tapes of dialect speech, and several more hoped to do so. And many referred to mimeographed exercises which they had used or planned to use. In short, new materials *were* being introduced. Several of our Evaluators remarked, however, that they were a bit dubious about some of the claims since they were never able to examine all of the materials that participants maintained they had introduced.

Half of those interviewed said they had changed their classroom procedures because of the course. They mentioned a variety of new class activities, only a few of which seemed fundamental. (Since many of the participants were master teachers before attending the Institutes, it is not necessarily a commentary upon the participants or the course that they made relatively few changes in their class techniques.) Among the new techniques mentioned were: having a class identify sentence elements by forms, having a class discuss sentences using the terminology of structural grammar, having panel discussions on the origin of language, using a more inductive approach in dealing with language phenomena, having a class make a language tree, using audio-

visual materials for language study, having class discussions of nonsense sentences.

Slightly over half said they had changed their assignments because of the course in language. The range was from putting slightly less emphasis on parsing to persuading an entire department to adopt assignments based on the assumption that language is a separate discipline worth understanding for its own sake. Neither so trivial nor so sweeping were assignments involving, for example, the history of the language, structural analysis, diction, linguistic analysis of a newspaper or of a novel, and a field study of the local vocabulary. Some said they were eliminating assignments calling for diagramming and the identification of parts of speech. A good many said they would change the nature of their assignments as soon as they knew enough about linguistics to do so.

When the various testimonies of the participants are added to the observations of our Evaluators, several conclusions about the Language course emerge. The first is that the participants, as a whole, did profit—and profit greatly. Most of those who had been blindly authoritarian became less so, and those who had been more receptive to the newer linguistic approaches had their perspectives enlarged and their fund of information greatly increased. The second point is that they did not profit enough. The information they retained was often confused, and their attempts to translate it into classroom activities betrayed their uncertainty. The third point is that *any* achievement under the circumstances seems like a minor miracle. The syllabus required the instructors to compress a huge amount of complex material into as few as 29 class hours. The terminology of structural and transformational grammar was new to all but a few of the participants. And for most of the participants the material was new, difficult, and often antithetical to notions about language that they had been cherishing since childhood. Where there was strong resentment against an Institute, its source could usually be found in the Language course. One especially vocal grumbler told one of our Evaluators that he hadn't heard a word in the first three weeks of the Language course that he believed, and he was damned if he was going to believe anything he heard in the last three weeks!

Faced with difficult material and often semihostile students, many of the language instructors performed almost unbelievably well. At the expense of coverage, they limited themselves to what the class could absorb. To avoid confusion, they concentrated on one grammar—usually structural grammar—and kept largely to one textbook. Instead of preaching, they drew the conclusion they wanted from the class after close examination of illustrative materials. Some of these instructors were immensely witty. And best of all, they took into account from the first day that many of the participants would not be receptive to what they had to say. Even these instructors, however, were not emphatic enough in warning the students at the outset that the course was to enrich their own thinking and was not one in which—as far too many hoped—they would receive a series of ingenious little gimmicks that could be used to eliminate grammatical errors in high-school themes.

Valuable in itself, the Language course should be even more helpful to others as a case study. Clearly, in future language courses the focus should be sharper and the coverage less. The attention to phonology, for example, should be considerably less if the same limitations on time obtain. The sequence of topics needs review. The linguists among our Evaluators felt that the course would have been received better if it had opened with syntax and moved to phonemics and finally to phonology. The classroom approach needs great study. Instructors *must* keep in mind the backgrounds and prejudices of the students; new grammatical concepts cannot be rammed down their throats. The advantages and disadvantages of traditional grammar should be explored before any discussion of a new grammar. Technical terminology should be introduced slowly. There should be no crusades. There should be as little preachment and as much demonstration as possible. Finally, the assignments need greater thought. No assignment should be given that is not followed by a discussion in class; otherwise, the many errors in the students' papers will remain in the students' minds as truths. In short, the CEEB Language course was an important and valuable experiment. It is no derogation of it to say that the reach of those who formulated and taught it exceeded their grasp. Those sponsoring future institutes should use the CEEB course, not as a model, but as a useful starting point for their own thinking.

The Composition Course. The principal aim of the Composition course was to help the participant become a better writer himself and a better critic of others' writing. It attempted "to give a new experience and awareness that will increase the teacher's power to evoke good writing from his students, both by better directed assignments and by more accurate judgments of their writing."

Since the composition experts attending the 1961 planning session could not agree on a single syllabus, they created two. The first was essentially subjective and experiential, stressing the role of the writer; the second was basically diagnostic, stressing the art of writing. The first syllabus was employed at Cornell, Harvard, Indiana, NYU, Penn State, Pittsburgh, Rutgers, Stanford, Tulane, and UCLA; the second, at Albany, Duke, Michigan, Nevada, Ohio State, St. Louis, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. Southern Illinois developed a synthesis of the two syllabi. It would be difficult to prove that one Composition course was more effective than the other. Our Evaluators found the first more interesting because the material was fresher and, possibly, more substantial. Furthermore, the instructors clearly had a more messianic fervor: their voices were pitched a bit higher; their gestures were more abandoned; and their assignments were more ingenious. But there was no evidence that they urged their students to a higher pitch of creative activity or that the students were more grateful. Indeed, the participants from the other course seemed later to find that its approach and materials were more helpful for teaching composition in high school.

During the 64 follow-up visits, slightly over 60% from the course emphasizing the role of the writer and 48% from the course emphasizing the artistic product said they had reorganized their work, at least in part, since returning from the Institutes. Participants from both groups testified that they were placing more stress on expository and less on imaginative writing, that they were trying harder to integrate the work in composition and literature, and that they were giving more emphasis to composition generally. In addition, participants from the first group mentioned reorganization in order to give more weight to such matters as the speaker's relation to his audience, "voice," tone, style, and definition; those from the second group emphasized changes to give greater stress to such matters as purpose, introductions, paragraph organization, transitions, and deadwood.

Slightly less than 58% from the first course and 60% from the second said they had introduced new teaching materials in composition, but the only widespread change seemed to be that they were using the exercises and mimeographed themes that had been handed out in the Institute classes. Interestingly, over twice as many from the second course as from the first were using Institute materials. A few, especially from the first course, said they had already changed their textbooks or planned to change them, and one said he had introduced the *Phaedrus* as a text. Most participants, however, indicated that the really significant change was in their *use* of materials rather than in the materials themselves. They maintained that they evoked sharper recognition from their old texts of such matters as voice and tone (first-course participants) and purpose, organization, and diction (second-course participants).

Of the participants from the course emphasizing the writer, 60% said they had made changes in classroom procedures; from the course emphasizing the written product, almost 70% said the same. Participants from both groups said they were making more use of mimeographed materials in class and hoped to be able to use an opaque projector. Both groups mentioned that they were having more class discussion and more close analysis in this discussion. Participants from the first course particularly mentioned experimentation with the Socratic method, with the integration in class of work in composition and literature, and with classroom conferences. Students from the second course mentioned experimentation with class analysis of themes, with class themes written under pressure of time, and with the grading of themes in class and by the class.

Two-thirds of the participants from the course emphasizing the role of the author maintained that they were changing their assignments; almost 80% from the course emphasizing the artistic product said the same. The changes attributed to the Institute courses by the two groups were almost precisely the same: they were assigning shorter and more frequent papers than before; they were placing greater emphasis upon expository writing; they were trying to focus their assignments more sharply and to make the statements of assignments more specific; they were attempting to vary their assignments more; having experienced the agony of having their own papers red penciled, they were reading their students' papers with more discernment and compassion; they were reading more for the overall effectiveness and less for mechanical lapses; and they were placing more emphasis upon marginal comments and less upon letter or numerical grades. One participant surely must have had his gears in reverse when he said that since the Institute—and presumably because of it—the English department of which he is head has drafted a list of penalties to assess in each grade level for theme errors.

The general assessment of the Composition courses by both groups was high: 75% approved of the objectives; 69% rated the organization of

their courses either "excellent" or "good"; 80% thought the level of difficulty "about right"; 73% rated its value for their own education either "extremely valuable" or "valuable"; and 64% thought the work "extremely helpful" or "helpful" in providing practical help for their high-school teaching. Participants from both groups stressed that the work in composition had made them more aware of what constitutes good writing, had made them more sensitive to their own shortcomings as writers, and had contributed substantially to their professional growth. They felt that their standards had stiffened and that their classroom work had grown more rigorous. The participants who had been in the course emphasizing the role of the author were both more generous in their praise and more damning in their criticism. Those from two of the Institutes held that this was their most exciting course and that there was no disappointing feature about it. Those from three others were almost unanimous in saying that the course lacked direction, the discussions were often juvenile, the *Phaedrus* was discussed to the point of tedium, and the emphasis on voice became so ridiculous that the concept became the favorite subject of dormitory jokes. At one Institute there was genuine appreciation for the time the instructor spent with the participants individually; at another the participants complained because the instructor was inaccessible. Comments from participants who had taken the course emphasizing the artistic product tended to be more general, but their comments also ranged from great praise to serious criticism, especially for the lack of clear direction. All of the participants interviewed from one Institute testified independently that they had come almost to worship their instructor, but they thought his course was useless!

From participant testimony and from their own observations, our Evaluators concluded that both courses were helpful and that neither had a clear edge over the other. Both succeeded in making the participants more aware of their own powers and limitations as writers. In so doing both contributed to their personal as well as their their professional development. What seemed especially attractive in the courses were the high standards usually required; the emphasis upon the relation between the writer and reader; the insistence upon honesty, orderliness, and simplicity; the variety in the kinds of writing examined and assigned; the occasional hints about how writing and reading assignments may be profitably brought together in order to enhance the development of both skills; and the admirable demonstration on the part of many instructors of how a student essay may be rigorously and yet sympathetically criticized.

As good as they were, though, the Composition courses could have been better. There seemed to be no compelling reason for two courses. Whatever the issues that split the group in the 1961 planning session, there seemed to be none during the time of the Institutes that was irresolvable. To the extent that the courses differed, they were simply complementary. Each would have been enriched by material from the other. A good course in composition, it would seem, should deal both with the producer and the product, as the synthesis achieved in the Southern Illinois Institute demonstrated.

The standards in the Composition course must be a matter of constant concern. The moment an instructor nodded, the course slipped down to the level of freshman English—or below. To deserve graduate credit, this must be an *advanced* course in writing. No textbook commonly employed in freshman English courses should be used. Nor should assignments commonly imposed on freshmen be made. The readings should be the finest in the fields of rhetoric and stylistics. The field of aesthetics could contribute much, and so might genetic criticism, such as that in *The Road to Xanadu*. The use of the *Phaedrus* proved that powerful rhetorical demonstrations, when not made an end in themselves, can be useful in a composition class. It hardly need be added that assignments should be ones that require the highest level of sensitivity and reflection of which the participants are capable. These are obvious generalizations, but they need to be stated. There was a serious question in the minds of our Evaluators as to whether some of the Composition courses merited graduate credit. Even the participants sometimes complained that they were not being pushed hard enough.

Class meetings should be reduced sufficiently to make individual conferences possible. Many of the composition instructors divided their class of 45 into two sections and met them separately. Their argument was that they could not handle a subject so intimate and detailed as composition in sections of more than 23. Our Evaluators could see no profound improvement in the quality of the discussion in these smaller sections, nor did the participants seem to feel that there was great advantage in them. Indeed, it might be argued that there was a drop in spirit as students moved from the full group in Literature or Language to the smaller group in Composition. What was far more important than the smaller section was the

personal conference. The highest morale and the liveliest discussion occurred in an Institute where the 45 participants met in one group three times a week and otherwise met individually with the instructor. What made the Composition classes in this Institute all the more remarkable was that the participants, as a group, were by no means the most intellectually gifted.

The writing assignments should frequently be combined with assignments in the Literature and Language classes. Although some staffs managed such integrated assignments often, others almost ignored the many opportunities to do so. The advantage of such assignments is that they not only give the student something significant to write about but they also sharpen his awareness of the interrelations among the several disciplines.

The criticizing of essays submitted by participants must be performed with a due regard for their especial sensitivities. The crashing denunciation or sarcastic quip that a freshman might laugh off will more than likely crush or anger an institute participant. Having criticized his inferiors for years, the participant is extraordinarily unprepared for criticism of his own work. Yet with adroit suggestion he can be led to see his weaknesses and be grateful for the insights. Many of the composition instructors were the best liked in the Institutes. But some were also the least liked; invariably, these were the ones whose criticisms were offhand, patronizing, and needlessly insulting.

The Composition courses, excellent as they were, need to be stiffened. Those planning future institutes would be well advised to synthesize the two Commission on English syllabi, retain and relate the salient elements in both, step up both the reading and writing assignments, and incorporate a round of individual conferences into the schedule of each fortnight.

The Workshop. The workshop seemed to be a nightmare for the staffs of most of the Institutes. This was the one aspect of the Institutes that seemed not to have been worked out with care. Franker than some of the others, one Director said he just wished the workshop would go away.

In theory the workshop was to be the capstone of the Institute. In the workshop the participants were to bring together the material from the three courses, integrate it, and apply it in working out lessons that they would then test in their own classes during the following school year. These laudable aims were achieved in substantial measure by a fair number of participants. But they were not achieved generally enough for it to be said that the workshop program as a whole was an outstanding success.

It is difficult and probably not necessary to describe the operation of the workshops in detail. There were thirteen different workshop schedules in the twenty Institutes, varying from one that required only two rather short afternoon meetings a week to one that set aside two whole weeks for workshop activities. In addition, there were at least 14 ways of organizing the workshops: everything from putting each participant on his own to dividing the participants into three large groups, one for each of the three disciplines. Such diversity, to be sure, does not necessarily indicate weakness, but in this instance our Evaluators came to feel that it did. The lack of uniformity in schedules and organization seemed to reflect a general uncertainty about the nature and function of the workshop program.

Nevertheless the workshops succeeded in bringing the participants together in relatively informal groups where they could share experiences and discuss their common professional problems. In the opinion of many participants, this was their most useful function. In addition, of course, the workshops resulted in the production of scores of projects and lesson plans worked out by the participants individually or in groups. Many of the simpler ones had already been tried out in high-school classes before our Evaluators visited the schools in January and February. Among the more ambitious and yet untried were a project in composition involving a ten-unit course curriculum and one in language calling for a sequential program in high-school linguistics. Undoubtedly the most ambitious, however, was the 200-page St. Louis "syllabus," a work which covered all three disciplines and attempted to outline a four-year sequence of studies designed to emphasize academic interests—both literary and scientific—and prepare the student for college work. For each grade the syllabus stated aims, provided a course of study, listed typical works to be assigned, and included a few detailed plans with suggestions for applying the studies of literature, composition, and linguistics in a specific context. As the Commission on English had hoped, many of the workshop projects, like the St. Louis syllabus, managed to combine work in two and sometimes three disciplines; that is, a project in the study of, say, Crane's "Open Boat" might include provisions for making a lexical gloss and for writing a critical essay.

Despite their accomplishments, the bulk of the evidence indicates that the workshops fell far

short of the hopes that the Commission had for them. The points of weakness were not hard to find; indeed, most of them were singled out for our Evaluators by the participants and by staff members as well. It should not be inferred from the following list of particulars that all of the workshops were weak at all of these points. Far from it. These were points of weakness, however, found commonly enough to bear mention. They should serve as warnings to supervisors in the future.

1. Objectives. The point has already been made that the results of the attempt by the Commission on English to use the workshops primarily for the amassing of teaching materials were not altogether fortunate. The objectives of a workshop should be less concerned with production and quantity, more concerned with the critical examination of concepts and procedures. Hence, a workshop should be, first of all, a place where the group as a whole can evaluate what they have been learning, where they can think up interrelations among the disciplines and see their possibilities for high-school teaching and high-school assignments, where they can share ideas, techniques, and dreams that they have not had an opportunity to share in the courses. The workshop should pull the participants into a group engaged in imaginative and constructive thought about their professional problems. Secondly, a workshop should have the more practical objective of giving the participant practice in adapting the material and techniques and philosophy of the courses to his own high-school teaching. Whether he completes several—or any—projects or lesson plans seems not to be so important as that he obtains supervised training in establishing high-level ends and means. If the participants are experienced teachers, as most of the CEEB participants were, they will already know a great deal about designing lesson plans and devising useful teaching techniques. The emphasis with such participants, therefore, should be on such matters as the articulation of parts in a cumulative and sequential curriculum, standards that will assure intellectual respectability, material consonant with the desired standards, and the approaches best calculated to be effective with the particular material and the particular students.

2. Leadership. Much too often the CEEB supervisor was grossly unsophisticated about high-school English. His sentiments were sound, but his advice was impractical. Patently, the supervisor of the workshop should be someone who is at once sympathetic with the philosophy and objectives of the institute and yet knows high-school teaching, the problems of curriculum making, and the techniques of dealing with high-school administrators. In essence, what is needed is "a Greek head on right Yankee shoulders."

3. Schedule. Many participants complained—and our Evaluators agreed—that when the courses and workshop operated concurrently, the schedule became much too heavy, even for the best students. Furthermore, the courses had far too little impact upon workshop projects when these projects had to be selected and organized while the courses were just getting under way. The workshop should follow the courses, not operate concurrently with them. In a six-week institute, the courses might profitably run for five and the workshop for one; in an eight-week institute, the distribution could be six and two. The objectives of the workshop may be explained during the weeks of the courses; plans may be laid, and materials provided. But the participant should not be asked to commit himself to a project until the courses are over—or almost over.

4. Organization. What the CEEB participants complained about most bitterly was the lack of organization in the workshops. Much too often they did not know clearly where the workshop was heading, or what their particular obligations were. The result was that individually or in groups they themselves too often had to try to make sense out of what one participant called "chaos." By its nature a workshop is more informal than a class. But the objectives must be just as clear and the sense of direction just as firm. From the beginning of the workshop, each participant should have a schedule showing the basic pattern: the general meetings, the group meetings, his individual meetings with the supervisor. If possible, such a schedule should indicate the stages in the development of the workshop activity. Although enough time should be allowed for spontaneous activity, a basic schedule should prevail to give the program a fundamental firmness.

How the participants were divided into groups for working on projects seemed not to be too critical a question in the workshops. The participants approved and disapproved every kind of division. Some liked to work individually; others did not. Some liked to work in small groups; others felt there was too great a tendency for one person to dominate a small group. Some liked large groups; others felt too many shirked assignments in large groups. Yet it seemed to our

Evaluators that the materials turned out by groups of between five and ten showed slightly more imagination and a higher intellectual caliber than those produced by participants working individually. The weight of the evidence, such as it is, therefore, seems to suggest that for the practical activities of the workshops the participants might most profitably be divided into small groups.

5. Standards. Some of the materials coming out of the CEEB workshops were embarrassingly mediocre. Included among these were projects involving nothing more than methodological tricks, lesson plans derived from those the participants had previously used, and proposals that seemed to assume that the typical high-school student is a moron. In at least one Institute, some of the materials submitted had been copied in large part from textbooks. And some were so dreamily impractical that they were apparently written primarily to impress the instructor with their novelty. In short, there was in most Institutes an almost dramatic difference between the intellectual levels at which the courses and the workshop operated. Yet if an institute is to be totally effective, the workshop must operate at the same high intellectual level as the courses. Discussion must be probing; lesson plans and projects must display both imagination and insight. To maintain these high standards is the difficult task of the workshop supervisor. It should be repeated that if a paragon can be found for an institute staff, he should be assigned to the workshop.

Integration of the Three Disciplines. One of the fondest hopes of the Commission on English was that the Institute staffs would not only teach graduate courses in the three disciplines, but would manage to integrate the three so that a composite—something we can properly call English—would emerge. Such integration was partly to be achieved in the courses through joint assignments, assignments that called two or three of the disciplines into play, constant references by each instructor to the courses being taught by the others, and so on. Primarily, though, the integration was to be achieved in the workshop where the participants were expected to select projects that would bring together at least two, and preferably all three, disciplines. Many plans produced in the workshops did so.

Generally speaking, however, the business of integrating the three disciplines seemed to be attacked half-heartedly. Too few suggestions about its possibilities appeared in the syllabi. Too little talk about it occurred at planning sessions. The assignments by the three instructors in an Institute were too seldom worked out together. Instructors visited one another's classes too seldom. Too few of the instructors had a lively awareness of all three disciplines. It was a rare Institute, for example, in which the literature and composition instructors really knew what the language instructor was doing. In some they suspected that they knew—and didn't like it.

Because the attempt to integrate the three disciplines seemed to create such thorny problems, our Evaluators had considerable discussion on the subject. If integration can be achieved at all, we finally felt, it can be achieved only by a staff in which each of the members has a lively awareness of all three disciplines. Furthermore, these staff members must plan their courses and the workshop together, plan their assignments together, plan their attack on student papers and projects together, and regularly visit one another's classes. These are the bare necessities for an institute designed to give the participants even a modest sense of how work in the three disciplines can be integrated.

But we had serious doubts about whether all this stress and strain are necessary. Frankly, we were not convinced that strong integration is a necessary aspect of the curriculum—or even that it is a realizable one. It would be pleasant, of course, to be able to demonstrate that English is a unified discipline rather than a congerie of disciplines. But no one has yet satisfactorily demonstrated that it is, and it does seem to be expecting too much to put the burden of proof on a six- or eight-week institute. It is enormously helpful to point out as many *interrelations* as possible between and among the three disciplines, but this is something quite different from attempting to integrate them. In the end, therefore, our Evaluators felt that the Institutes were not to be criticized too harshly for not having managed to integrate the work in the three areas. Maybe they were searching for a chimera.

Ending this discussion of the curriculum with an evaluation of the workshops skews the total impression unfortunately. Valid in theory, they were unimpressive in practice. But they can easily be improved upon, and they should be kept as a necessary part of an institute designed on a broad scale to step up the competence of the high-school English teacher.

Evaluation of the Parts of the Curriculum by the Participants. The 64 participants interviewed in the follow-up visits were asked to rank the four parts of the curriculum for their intellectual excitement. According to their responses, the

Literature and Composition courses were almost equally exciting; the Language course ran a respectable third; the workshop trailed very badly indeed. They were also asked to rank the four parts for their practical helpfulness. The Composition course won by a large margin; the Literature course was second; the Language course just managed to shade the workshop for third. It is worth noting that the workshop was ranked last even for its practical value. In another poll these participants indicated that they felt that the required reading and classroom discussion were of almost equal value in contributing to their effectiveness as teachers, that the required writing was third most valuable, that informal discussion with participants was fourth most valuable, and that conferences with instructors were by a tremendously wide margin least valuable. The chief reason for the low opinion of conferences with instructors was that the instructors, except for a very few, failed to hold any.

The last word should be a tribute to the vision and wisdom of the members of the Commission on English who planned these Institutes, financed them, and saw them through to completion. Their format was sound in principle; their staffs were dedicated and hard-working; and their participants, whatever the weaknesses of particular Institutes, were immensely benefited. What is possibly most impressive is the continuing influence of the Institutes, not only in the classrooms and school systems of the 1962 participants, but also in the universities that have imitated the program in 1963—and doubtless now in the classrooms of *their* participants. Such influence deserves to spread. For while our evaluation has stressed—possibly overstressed—certain of the operational weaknesses of the original Institutes, it has not criticized their basic principles or the overall organization. Taken as a whole, the program is both comprehensive and intellectually respectable. If the general competence of high-school teachers *can* be substantially improved within a summer session, institutes modelled on the CEEB plan seem to be the most promising means for doing it.

University of Iowa
Iowa City

ENGLISH LITERATURE OVERSEAS: A REPORT ON A BRITISH CONFERENCE

By John Ashmead

THE BRITISH Council Conference on the teaching of English Literature overseas was held at King's College, Cambridge, England, 16–18 July 1962. As K. R. Johnstone, Deputy Director-General of the British Council, pointed out, this was the first conference on teaching English Literature overseas, though such teaching has been in progress for over a century. More than seventy-five participants came from twenty-five different countries, and had taught in many more. The discussions of the conference were taped and will be published in a 60,000 word book by the firm of Methuen.

The initial impetus for the Conference came from a feeling expressed most strongly by members of the British Council, that English literature teaching overseas, if continued in its present old-fashioned form, might vanish from many overseas programs. In his report on the study of English Literature in Afro-Asian countries, John Holloway expressed forcibly the need for a new vitality in literature studies comparable to that in recent linguistic studies.

The Conference met in plenary sessions at its beginning and end (16 July and 18 July). The first three Commissions, which met on 16 and 17 July, studied respectively (1) English Literature in Universities Overseas, (2) English Literature in Adult Education, and (3) English Literature in Schools (and in the Training of Teachers of English). The announced topics for all three Commissions were examinations, syllabuses, and techniques of English Literature teaching, but the actual debates ranged very widely at times.

The remaining four Commissions met once on 17 July and had as their general topic that of Teaching Aids; these Commissions studied (4) Provision of Texts, (5) Periodicals, (6) Broadcasting and Recordings, and (7) Visual Media.

The crucial issue was strongly raised at the initial plenary session: that there were widespread doubts and dissatisfaction concerning the teaching of English Literature overseas, especially in countries which used English as a Second Language (as a Lingua Franca, or as what is sometimes termed a Language of Wider Communication). It was quickly conceded that in Europe the problem is "mainly linguistic." But elsewhere English Literature, so it was argued, may, like Latin literature before it, vanish as a significant civilizing force.

Some special problems received repeated attention. In Indian high schools the official requirement is 250 English structures and 2500 words, but with this equipment Indian students are unable to read such standard literary works as those of Shakespeare, Lamb, Shelley, or Keats. The situation in Africa was described as far worse. Participants in the Conference agreed that English Honors Degree Candidates are very good, but they also agreed that very few such candidates were being produced overseas. All the participants described overseas literary research as very poor. One speaker noted that the General Certificate in English Literature has the poorest predictive value of all the Certificates; nor, strangely enough, does it always have a close correlation with any marks for purely linguistic ability.

Some of the difficulty in teaching English Literature overseas has arisen from the rapid expansion of education, coupled with a decrease in the number of expatriate teachers of English because of poor job security, low pay, poor prospects in England on return home, and lack of permanent career posts overseas. Obvious remedies, all costly, came up for discussion; the sense of the meeting was that, ideally, overseas teaching should be a career in its own right.

Some useful distinctions arose in plenary sessions and in the several Commissions. (1) Developing nations in the process of achieving modern levels of industrialism and commerce, with long cultural histories (Bengal, Iran) need English literature in the broadest sense for help in understanding life in modern society. (2) Emerging nations, those dependent on present and future developments not only for economic but for cultural viability, need access to the whole history of a major culture such as English, especially through its literature. (3) Established nations (as in Europe) where English is studied as a foreign culture, with much of the teaching done not in English but in the local language, require what are essentially comparative literature studies.

The very great diversity of teaching conditions made it necessary for the participants in the Con-

ference to remind themselves of these groupings again and again. In fact delegates from time to time expressed a feeling of helplessness because of the differences in their situations. For example, even among the teachers from Africa, a sharp distinction had to be made between West Africa and the Sudan. The Conference was most strongly and vocally represented from Africa (including Egypt) and India, somewhat underrepresented from Southeast Asia and the Far East, and very much underrepresented, strangely enough, when it came to the problems of teaching English literature in Europe.

One issue arose several times in various forms. Should more modern works of literature be taught overseas? By modern was meant apparently novels and poetry from 1800 to 1935, and one or two plays after 1946. One speaker suggested that modern literature should be taught first to non-specialists, but last to specialists in English Literature. One speaker cautioned against an unhistorical use of modern (or past) literature purely for moral edification; this speaker warned that Shakespeare in India had turned into some sort of Indian guru.

The question of modern literature led to the question of modern American literature. A British Council survey recently carried out in Senior Secondary Schools in Uganda had revealed that these schools were against the use of modern American writers in any examination syllabus. Most of the participants in the Conference, however, including teachers from Africa, were in favor of the use of modern American literature in the examination syllabus. When the participants were advised that American professors had requested USIA to provide English literature classics as well as American books in USIS libraries, it was agreed to ask the British Council, within its limited budget, to make a similar effort. Delegates stressed the need overseas for books about local conditions, and the need for English novels and translations with local settings. Debate went on as to whether second-rate literature, such as detective stories, should be used. Contemporary literary criticism was rejected as completely unsuitable, but, somewhat inconsistently perhaps, there was much approval of I. A. Richards' *Practical Criticism.* There was no agreement as to whether a larger or smaller quantity of literature should be read and tested than at present.

Because of pressure from overseas students of English, many of whom at the university level are writers or would-be writers, there was much interest in the American type of creative writing course. Conference members noted that they had no satisfactory way of dealing with ambitious writers in their classes, aside from some amateur theatricals, translations, and courses in reading modern literature.

The dominant definition of literature at the Conference was that first expressed in the British Government Resolution of 1835 (which perhaps originated with Macaulay), of "imparting to the native population a knowledge of English literature and science through the medium of the English language." English literature in this context, as several delegates pointed out, would inevitably include philosophy, law, history, and poetry, and literary study would consist of describing a culture in English. But the talk at the Conference and the available samples of curriculums suggested that English overseas practice puts much stress on learning poetry, on interpretation of texts, and on literary style. There was no evidence of anything like an American Studies or American Civilization approach to literature. One Indian speaker was strongly against using literature for sociological and anthropological purposes (he favored instead studies in comparative literature of an elementary kind). Another Indian spoke strongly in favor of the "pure literature" approach. (A debate between these Indian teachers and those now being trained in the U. S. in American Studies might be a very exhilarating event.)

In the Visual Aids Commission, at which I spoke on the uses of the Carnegie Color Slide Collection, *The Arts of the United States,* it was agreed that much could be done along similar lines to use color slides to supplement the teaching of English literature. This Commission stressed the growing use of 8 mm. films in education.

Though the Conference as a whole centered on literature, a number of items of linguistic interest came up. There was general agreement that the teacher of English literature overseas should learn one of the local languages. The problem of Ghana was noted, however; there the poor instructor would have to choose from among eight languages and thirty-six dialects. Nigeria and West Africa, it was noted, present even greater hazards to the practitioner of linguistic good will. There was also agreement that an instructor overseas should know "phonetics." But a European lecturer stated flatly that European universities, at least, preferred to have their own nationals teach phonetics, and did not want any foreign interference in this part of the curriculum.

The University Commission, and several other Commissions, mentioned problems of teaching

prosody (a subject which hardly ever comes up during discussions of teaching American literature overseas). The subject of prosody played an important part in British overseas examinations and syllabuses. The delegates expressed interest in the new linguistic approach to prosody now developing in America (as represented in such inexpensive and useful texts as George Hemphill's edition of *Discussions of Poetry: Rhythm and Sound* [Boston, 1961]).

Several speakers, without using the technical word, were obviously drilling their students in intonation patterns in order to encourage the appreciation of literary readings from such writers as D. H. Lawrence and Jane Austen; they were unfamiliar with the work of Kenneth Pike and others on intonation. There was no discussion of programmed instruction (so-called machine teaching), or of its possible uses in solving linguistic and literary teaching problems.

Though there was a substantial textbook exhibit, it was surprising to find how few texts of English literature, classic or modern, are available in a form suitable for overseas students. None were listed which contain systematic (and modern) linguistic analysis or aid. The need was pointed up at the Conference by frequent references to the miserable failure of an unedited text of *Moby Dick* as an examination book. The striking lack of success of *Moby Dick* was mentioned a number of times with obvious relish while all eyes harpooned the lone American participant. The even more disastrous failure of Sir Walter Scott in both poetry and prose resulted in no such glances towards the Scottish participant.

I. A. Richards made the point that one can't separate literature from language; that literature is only a way of doing a good job with the language, and one can do a good job with a very small vocabulary. Whether Basic English is actually a small vocabulary, or a disguised form of a large vocabulary, was not discussed. Only two speakers from the floor made any specific case for the relevance of modern general linguistics to the study of literature; one speaker argued that linguistics could now handle literary texts, but gave no specific examples.

A crucial difficulty of work in literature was said to be the fact that people may be linguistically immature, but emotionally mature. It was felt that literary readings supply a desirable and indeed essential "contextualization" of language.

One of the most provocative arguments arose from a debate about the need to teach Hindi literature in India, rather than English literature. Both Hindi specialists and Egyptian specialists conceded that gaps in local language literary training made it desirable to teach English literature in these two instances (for example, one could hardly learn about the concept of genres in literature by studying Egyptian literature alone). But a vigorous young African resisted the notion that African cultures have literatures which are insufficient in scope for serious study, and he made the telling point that African literature exists but is primarily oral. The counter-argument was that if oral African literature is so good, why do Africans demand the study of English literature in their schools? Both sides seemed unaware of the steady shift towards oral and electronic (sometimes called non-typographical) literature in the last thirty years, a shift which is accelerating in both American and English literature; ironically enough, the very proceedings of the Council Conference were being preserved as we talked by electronic means, and would be essentially oral literature even in their final book form.

The effect of the various overseas examinations, especially the Cambridge Overseas School Certificate, had been expected by the planners of the Conference to be one of the main topics of debate, but this subject received nowhere near its allotted time. Perhaps the reason was that the Overseas School Certificate reflects very quickly the desires of the teachers themselves. Some members of the Conference (not teachers themselves) interpreted this teacherly influence as conservative and bad.

Participants in the Conference welcomed materials sent by the Washington Center for Applied Linguistics, especially the bibliographical listings, discussions of exams, and descriptions of linguistic films. Several Commissions were interested in the results of American experiments on improving the reading speed of overseas students. American methods of graduate training were praised, and it was agreed that foreign students, whenever this could be afforded, should spend one year of general study in England before beginning more specialized research.

To conclude, the Conference must have left the participants with a clear sense of the requirement that English literature, as a useful subject, needs some modernization if it is to survive overseas, especially in Africa and Asia. This modernization might include greater use of visual aids, greater reliance on the discoveries of linguistics (some participants suggested an international conference on the relationship of linguistics to the advanced study of literature), a broader view of literature which might be comparable to our

American Civilization concept, and greater functional relation of English literature to the life and career of the overseas student.

In the modern period there was fairly complete recognition of the need for studying American literature along with English literature. A major development during the Conference was the acknowledgment that English literature had to mean all "literature in English"—that is, American literature and other overseas literature, as well as that of the British Isles.

Of the more general remarks made at the Conference, especially significant was that of Professor V. Gokak of India, who saw English Literature as helping to modernize Asian literature, and helping also to bring about the understanding and trust that should exist between peoples and cultures. G. Bullough, Chairman of the Conference, thoughtfully stressed in his remarks on teaching English Literature overseas, the interchanging and strengthening of values which occur on both sides when such teaching is at its best.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE
Haverford, Penn.

THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION LOOKS AT PROJECT ENGLISH*

By Ralph C. M. Flynt, *Associate Commissioner for Educational Research and Development, U. S. Office of Education*

IT IS with considerable pleasure that I meet with you today to discuss the mutual efforts of the community of English scholars, teachers of English and the Office of Education in the enterprise which we have come to call Project English. Just one year ago we were in the throes of attempting to organize this joint effort. As many of you know, this was a period of considerable casting about to determine the directions and magnitude of our effort in this area.

Today I am most happy to report that we in the Office of Education consider Project English, our first venture in the area of programmed curriculum research and development, to be on the way to becoming a substantial success. We hope that you join us in the pride that we have in the year's accomplishment. My mission now is to tell you quite simply that with your support and with the growing involvement of the English scholar, Project English will long endure.

If you will allow me the historian's prerogative of attempting to relate the past to the present and thus to structure the future, I should like to tell you about our reasons for inaugurating Project English and our hopes for the future growth of the project.

Viewed in its proper perspective, Project English is an expression of the growing Federal concern for excellence in education. While we often assume that governmental interest in science and educational improvement was launched with Sputnik I, our country has long encouraged both scientific endeavour and educational enterprises. The creation of the Smithsonian Institution in 1846, the Morrill Act establishing the land-grant colleges in 1862, the founding of the National Academy of Sciences in 1863, and the United States Office of Education in 1867, all give evidence of this concern early in our national history. In more recent years, the emergence of the Office of Naval Research in 1946, the National Institutes of Health in 1938, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the National Science Foundation in 1950, and the Cooperative Research Program of the United States Office of Education in 1956 are new evidences of continued interest.

In the post World War II era, this interest took a new direction as we re-examined our involvement in educational research. It soon became apparent to us that, despite the impressive gains in research findings, the fruits of this research are all too often not to be found in the classroom. Despite all we now know about learning theory and pedagogy, the traditional patterns of the teaching-learning process have remained largely unchanged except for occasional minor refinements, usually in the direction of reinforcement of existing methods, and the chronological creep from kindergarten through college remains practically inviolate over the years. Some progress has been made in revising the curriculum, but despite the combined efforts of the Office of Education and the National Science Foundation the new mathematics programs, for example, still meet considerable resistance.

The failure to bring about a practical realization of the promise of educational research results is due to the fact that research and development aimed at improving education has been so meager that it has never been taken seriously by most educators. This is as much the result of the ineptness and lack of vision of the researcher as it is the product of the educator's natural tendency to cling to the security of old and familiar practices. Until very recently, educational research has not been regarded as a particularly respectable field of endeavour by the best scholars in such fields as history, English, economics, anthropology, sociology, and psychology. As a result, the responsibility for educational research was left almost entirely to faculties of education, who have labored valiantly but under great handicaps and, therefore, with distressingly small results. Without help, and faced with the criticisms of his colleagues in the humanities and the natural and social sciences, the educationist has been compelled to create small, manageable research projects, so fragmented, and often on such minor subjects, that the really critical problems of education have remained unresolved.

This project-by-project approach has served educational research well as a means of establishing a firm base for the development of techniques, but is not effective as a means for practical implementation of research results. A careful scrutiny of research in the physical sciences,

* An address given at the Conference of Chairmen of English Departments in Washington, D. C., 29 December 1962.

medicine, and the behavioral sciences, all of which are further along in the improvement of research techniques than education, reveals that the project approach loses its utility when it is applied to the resolution of major problems. The project approach has proven most valuable in basic research, where the investigator has a particular hypothesis or series of hypotheses which he desires to test. Thus, the project is essentially a technique for focusing attention on some discrete problem within a relatively narrow area of interest. The identification of a particular strain of virus is an example of the project approach in medical research. A project which seeks to determine the effects of various forms of discipline on student achievement is a similar example from educational research. In both cases the investigator is examining the interaction of variables under relatively controlled conditions. But, because of the very nature of the rigid controls necessary to basic research, the operation of these variables outside the laboratory or the experimental classroom is left unanswered unless basic research findings are field-tested in a variety of situations. And after field-testing they must be demonstrated and eventually disseminated to the practitioners before research can have any impact on practice.

As you well know, this pattern formed the basis for the joint efforts of the Office of Education and the Modern Language Association under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act. As a result of these efforts, the benefits of this program have now reached a substantial proportion of the language teachers in the United States.

In an endeavor to help the teaching of English as we have helped instruction in foreign languages, mathematics, and the sciences, the Office of Education in 1962 established Project English.

Abraham Ribicoff, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, had referred to English as the "keystone" of American education. Sterling M. McMurrin, then Commissioner of Education, expressed repeated concern for the improvement of instruction in English, while emphasizing the role of the Office in conducting research and disseminating information without any desire or attempt to create a national curriculum. And President Kennedy said in his message to Congress on 6 February 1962: "The control and operation of education in America must remain the responsibility of State and local governments and private institutions. . . . But the Congress has long recognized the responsibility of the Nation as a whole—that additional resources, meaningful encouragement, and vigorous leadership must be added to the total effort by the Federal Government if we are to meet the task before us. For education in this country is the right—the necessity—and the responsibility of all. Its advancement is essential to national objectives and dependent on the greater financial resources available at the national level."

But this awareness of need was in no way restricted to governmental leaders. Scholars and teachers had long realized that English teaching has been steadily hampered by insufficient research, too little experimentation, insufficient dissemination of what is known, and uncertainty about the best ways to deal with the tremendous complexities of the language, the multitudinous literary selections that might conceivably enrich learning, and the great differences among children themselves.

For a number of years, teachers of English had been aware that significant improvement in the teaching of English in the country's elementary and secondary schools and colleges could be attained only through more massive and coordinated efforts than have yet been possible. In 1958, the National Council of Teachers of English went on record as favoring national leadership in solving some of the most pressing problems, such as inadequately prepared teachers, recruitment, team teaching, lay readers, programmed instruction, and other innovations. In 1961, in cooperation with other groups, the NCTE spelled out many of the existing deficiencies and needs in *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, a book that was favorably reviewed from coast to coast, and has influenced profession and public alike.

Also in 1958, with a grant from the Ford Foundation administered by the Modern Language Association, a group of prominent teachers and administrators, representing all levels of instruction, held a series of conferences to classify and clarify the basic issues in the teaching of English. This statement appears as part of the conclusion of that report: "What is needed is financial support for several large articulated programs, with suitable means of testing and evaluating achievement at the various levels and facilities for disseminating the findings throughout the profession."

It is in such a context that Project English was developed in the Office of Education, in consultation with representatives of State agencies, organizations of administrators and librarians, and experts in the field of English teaching, curriculum, and supervision at all academic levels.

So much for background. What are the future possibilities? The purpose was and continues to be the development of a new, articulated curriculum for English by English scholars and educators. We anticipate that the new English curriculum will be devoted substantially to language, composition, and literature. We must avoid the cluttered sequence of courses which today is sometimes called "English."

We now find that elementary and secondary and college teachers of English are approaching agreement that their task is threefold and that they should concentrate on an integrated program of instruction in the nature and characteristics of the English language, the improvement of written and spoken composition, and the reading of the best materials that children at a given point of development are able to comprehend. It is to this end that we have directed Project English.

If the general public and the administrators and teachers in the country's schools feel that the improvement of writing and reading abilities is important enough, if Congressional support is obtainable, and if we can continue to enlist the aid of English scholars and educators, the program may follow somewhat the progress already made in other subjects.

Among the long-range possibilities for Project English are these:

a. Institutes for elementary and secondary teachers to acquaint them with recent advances in study of the English language, literary criticism, the psychology of learning, curricular practices, and other subjects. These may be supplemented by an increased number of evening or Saturday seminars on nearby campuses.

b. Encouragement to State educational agencies to secure the services of English specialists. Ten States which now have such specialists are finding that they are making splendid contributions, comparable to those already being made by specialists in such subjects as foreign languages or agriculture or home economics, trades and industry, and the like.

c. Special scholarships, fellowships, or loans to teachers for professional improvement.

d. Refresher seminars for college teachers.

e. Study of college programs designed to prepare elementary and secondary teachers.

f. Assistance to liberal arts graduates to enable them to meet certification requirements.

g. Recruitment of additional able young persons into the profession.

h. Work on the problem, existing in many schools, of an inadequate supply of books and other materials.

i. Examination of the roles of such innovations as programmed instruction, television teaching, team teaching, and lay readers.

j. Study of "fringes": slow and bright children, culturally deprived and culturally rich areas, special content in special situations.

k. Demonstration centers: several schools in each State to test and to "exhibit" various curricular practices of apparent value.

l. Dissemination in printed or other forms of the significant findings of the Project.

How many of these possibilities will become realities is not known. Other possibilities may be added to the list upon the substantiated advice of interested members of the profession.

In an increasingly complex society, our young people must and can learn to read and write—and think—better than they do. They can and must learn more about man's life and dreams and potential, as revealed in literature. Project English, it is hoped, will substantially supplement the steps already being taken toward these goals. But if we have learned one lesson from our experiences in curriculum research and development in all areas of knowledge, it is that above all else, the key to curriculum improvement is the direct involvement of the subject matter specialist—the scholar as well as the educator. Therefore, we ask you to join with us in this great undertaking.

PROJECT ENGLISH: THE FIRST YEAR*

By J. N. Hook, *Coordinator for Project English: U. S. Office of Education*

THIS WILL be a brief, factual, uncolored, and dull account of the first year of Project English. To understand the first year, however, we should go back a little further.

Leaders in the teaching of English have long recognized how seriously the profession has been handicapped by lack of funds needed for its improvement. One NCTE study of a dozen years ago listed hundreds of research topics in need of methodical examination; articles in both professional and lay publications have asked questions to which we have no answers; a number of NCTE presidential addresses in the past fifty years have directly or indirectly suggested problems and needs; the Basic Issues Conferences of 1958, involving ASA, CEA, MLA, and NCTE, asked 35 key questions and 97 subquestions, according to the count by George Winchester Stone, Jr.

The needs, then, are understood, but before Project English the searches for some of the answers were conducted on shoestring money. They were carried on by graduate students, by professors who stole time from their other responsibilities, and by committees which, if NCTE is a fair example, had annual budgets of twenty-five to a hundred dollars.

In 1958, when the National Defense Education Act provided Federal funds for improvement of instruction in science, mathematics, and the foreign languages, the NCTE by official resolution pointed out that English, too, makes its contributions to national needs, and requested comparable support. In 1960, representatives of the MLA, the ASA, the CEA, the American Council on Education, and the American Council of Learned Societies assisted the NCTE in the preparation of the influential book *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, published in 1961, a small volume that gave dramatic evidence of the extent and the nature of the need. Later in 1961, when Congress held hearings on the extension of the NDEA to include English, this book was reprinted in full in the fat volume of testimony.

In April 1961, testifying before Congress, Commissioner Sterling McMurrin described the "utmost importance" of "more adequate instruction" in English. In September 1961,Congress authorized limited expenditures for improvement of English instruction through use of funds under Public Law 531, administered by the Cooperative Research Branch of the Office of Education. Thus was born Project English. In its first fiscal year the Project had approximately $400,000 available; in the second fiscal year, about $900,000.

Until February 1962, the Project had no coordinator. Plans were made in the Office of Education after some preliminary conferences, generally informal, with representatives of appropriate professional and scholarly organizations. Announcements were made at NCTE and MLA conventions, among others, of the availability of funds for curriculum study centers and for research projects. It was necessary at first to fit the various pieces of Project English into the existing machinery of the Cooperative Research Branch. This meant, among other things, adherence to the deadlines already established by that Branch, and meant also that the method of selection of proposals had to conform to the procedures then in use.

In early February an invitational conference was held in which representatives of eleven national organizations, from all levels of instruction, met with Office of Education personnel to discuss the plans already made and to give advice on future directions. Following that conference I developed, as the newly appointed Coordinator, some guidelines under the title "Tentative Recommendations for Project English." I based these recommendations upon the conference, upon consultations with persons inside and outside the Office of Education, upon the book *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, and upon my own experience in teaching and working with teachers on the elementary, secondary, and college levels. Project English, almost everyone agreed, must serve all academic levels; it must serve teachers of varying competency; it must serve students with low ability, average ability, and high ability.

I shall not detail the recommendations. They fell into four major categories. (1) Through curriculum study centers and research projects we need to answer as many as possible of the big unanswered questions concerning the teaching of English. One of the most important questions, to which the curriculum study centers are addressing themselves, is how to develop curricular pat-

* An address given at the Conference of Chairmen of English Departments in Washington, D. C., 29 December 1962.

terns that will take into account both the logical sequences of our subject and the varying rates at which children develop. (2) We need to find ways of increasing the knowledge and the competence of teachers now in the classroom. Institutes, seminars, and in-service programs, along with improved supervision, would be most effective here. (3) We need to improve present programs for preparing teachers of English. The NCTE will publish a book on this topic soon, and an NCTE conference on teacher education has been planned. The likely role of the Federal government here will be to assist in the establishment of pilot programs in teacher education in English. (4) We need a better system of disseminating information about what we already know concerning the teaching and learning of English, and about many of the good things now going on in the classrooms of the nation. I recommended studies of improved ways to retrieve and disseminate the findings of research, and I recommended demonstration centers to extend knowledge of excellent curriculums and teaching procedures.

The months since February have been busy and productive. We have established six curriculum study centers,[1] conducted several significant conferences and research development studies, contracted for more than thirty basic and applied research projects, and made plans for demonstration centers. I shall say a few words about each of these.

Each curriculum study center is supported by about a quarter of a million dollars in Federal money, plus institutional contributions in varying amounts. Each center will, over a period of about five years, attempt to develop and test a sequential curriculum for specified grades and with particular emphases. At Carnegie Institute of Technology a curriculum in English for the able college-bound students in grades 10, 11, and 12 is being developed. At Hunter College the focus is on English for the culturally deprived in the junior-high-school years. At Minnesota the program stresses linguistics in the high-school years. Nebraska, most ambitious in scope, covers grades K-13, with particular attention to composition and rhetoric. Northwestern also emphasizes composition and rhetoric; its coverage is grades 7–14. Oregon will build upon the earlier Portland study of a well-balanced program in English for the high-school years.

In May 1962, in Pittsburgh, we held a conference involving about fifty persons: leaders in the profession, elementary and secondary and college teachers, librarians, school administrators, psychologists, and representatives of state departments of education. The topic was "Needed Research in the Teaching of English." Excerpts from the final report have appeared in NCTE journals, and the complete report is available from the Office of Education. Also in May, in Washington, we held a conference on English for the culturally deprived in large cities. A monograph on that conference is being prepared. In November, in Washington, there was a conference on the teaching of reading to young children. Early in December at the University of Illinois, Project English provided funds for a conference of English Department chairmen.

Still under the heading of research development, we have under way a study of what is now known about the teaching of composition—an analytical summary of research. We have allocated funds for a special study of the implications, as far as English is concerned, of Project Talent, a million dollar study of the characteristics and knowledge of 440,000 high-school students from all parts of the country. Another study involves placing on tape a huge corpus of modern prose for linguistic analysis by computers. Then, with the cooperation of the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board, a team headed by John Gerber is studying the Commission's institutes of last summer, so that if Federal funds for institutes become available we shall be able to profit from earlier experience.

The first thirty research studies to get under way do not fall very neatly into groups, but the following rough breakdown shows the tendencies: six of the studies are in reading; five are in college freshman composition; five are in linguistics; four are in high-school composition; two are in spelling; one each is in elementary composition, the high-school curriculum, and speech; and five are miscellaneous or cut across lines, e.g., a comparative study of the achievements in reading, writing, and spelling of English, Scottish, and American children. None of these studies is in literature *per se*, although research in reading has implications for literature. Congressional interest in English tends to focus on it as a utilitarian subject, but the legislation is broad enough that study of the teaching of literature is not excluded; the curriculum study centers, for example, necessarily devote some of their attention to this part of our work in English.

A deadline of January 1963 was set for demonstration center proposals.[2] We asked for imaginative plans for carrying to the nation the details

[1] The number has since grown to ten with centers added at Florida State, Georgia, Columbia Teachers Coll., and Wisconsin.

[2] Four proposals have since been approved: at California (Berkeley), New York Univ., Syracuse, and Western Reserve.

of excellent English programs already in existence.

Three final points in this abbreviated summary. The first is that the quality of proposals for research and centers has been steadily rising. If there were time, I could document that generalization. The second point is that the Cooperative Research Branch has changed its procedures for evaluating proposals in such a way that the key decisions on English proposals are made by a committee in which English specialists have a major voice. The third and last point is that as Coordinator of Project English I have been helped by elementary teachers, secondary teachers, college teachers, administrators, psychologists, librarians, representatives of state departments of education, and many persons in the Office of Education. I am grateful for all that assistance. Whatever Project English is doing now or will do, whatever it contributes to the improvement of instruction in English, is dependent upon the continuance of such cooperation. I have been most pleased by two things: that my colleagues in college departments of English are showing increased eagerness to share in solving the pressing problems of our profession, and that the support of the Office of Education has been complete and wholehearted. During my term as Coordinator, everything I have asked for in the Office has been granted if the law permitted and if money was available. The interest, the concern, and the eagerness to serve are there. College departments of English may do much to channel that eagerness in the most productive ways.

COLLEGE ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS AND PROFESSIONAL EFFORTS TO IMPROVE ENGLISH TEACHING*

By James R. Squire, *Executive Secretary, National Council of Teachers of English*

JEROME K. BRUNER, the distinguished psychologist from Harvard who may presently be influencing American education more deeply than any other individual, recently asserted that this country is embarked on a permanent revolution in education based on a broad redefinition of the nature of the educational profession. This revolution in the educational Establishment is symbolized, says Bruner, by the presence of Nobel laureates in physics devoting their talents and energies to the devising of school curricula in science. Underlying the revolution is the assumption that "those who know a subject most deeply know best the great and simple structuring ideas in terms of which instruction must proceed."[1]

Now whatever we think about Mr. Bruner's own theories of teaching and learning, we must concede, I think, that many recent advances in the teaching of science, the teaching of mathematics, and the teaching of the modern languages have resulted from the recognition by great numbers of scholars that part and parcel of their broad responsibility to their subject is the assumption of some measure of responsibility for the teaching of the subject at all educational levels. The past decade has seen the leaders of these other disciplines learning to work closely and well with colleagues in education and psychology, learning to work shoulder to shoulder with teachers in the schools, devising new curricula, preparing new materials, introducing new approaches to instruction.

Is this beginning to happen in English? Certainly some farsighted scholars in language and literature have long worked to improve instruction. But insofar as the teaching of English is concerned, their leadership on the national scene has not until recently been emulated by the rank and file of college English professors on many campuses throughout the country, where not infrequent breakdowns in cooperation—indeed breakdowns in communication and even in goodwill—between college English, college education, and the schools work to our permanent disadvantage. For want of leadership or want of concern, we in English have permitted half of the nation's English classes to be taught by teachers without majors in our subject. For want of leadership or want of concern, we have graduated from departments of English vast numbers of college majors planning to teach who have had little or no preparation in the English language or in composition and often inadequate preparation in literature. For want of leadership or want of concern, we too often have been unwilling to assist the schools in evaluating curricula, in planning programs, or in providing for the continuing education of teachers of English.

I accept Jerome Bruner's assumption that he who knows a subject most deeply knows best the great and simple structuring ideas around which a curriculum may be organized. I believe that basic insights into the nature of language, literature, and composition must emerge from the study of informed scholars. And I rejoice in the possibility that the new interest of college English departments in the teaching of English may lead to revolutionary changes in the educational enterprise as predicted by Mr. Bruner.

But I know, too, that the identification of the great and simple structuring ideas is only the beginning of curricular reform. Whatever the content of English on which we are able to agree, this content must be linked to learning and to teaching if it is to permanently affect our schools. And such links will occur only as specialists in college English, like those in mathematics, science, and modern languages before them, learn to work respectfully and continually with specialists on teaching, administration, and curriculum who are devoting *all* of their professional careers to improving instruction at regional and national levels.

It is not enough for a department to issue a bulletin on "what the colleges want" and settle back to wait for expected changes. It is not enough to offer a single summer institute for teachers or a single two-day conference and assume that the department's obligations have been discharged for that academic year. It is not enough to appoint a single departmental specialist in the teaching of English and assign to him all of the work involving articulation with schools or with other university departments.

Important as these steps must be in any insti-

* An address given at the Conference of Chairmen of English Departments, Washington, D.C., 29 December 1963.

[1] Jerome Bruner, "The New Educational Technology," *The American Behavioral Scientist*, VI (November 1962), 5.

tution, they are not in the long run a substitute for day-by-day concern and leadership on the part of key members of many college departments, a concern which must be as sincere and as basic as that which we habitually devote to the functions of departments which seem the most central, such as to the nature of our graduate programs or to provisions for encouraging scholarship. Not until the teaching of English really receives attention of this quality by leaders within our departments can we honestly say it is more than a stepchild, an appendage which we cannot forget but do not really choose to accept. Whether it ever receives such basic attention in some departments will depend in large measure on the leadership exerted by the chairman. I am a realist and I do not minimize the problems ahead.

Assumption of responsibility means ultimately that college English departments must find ways of working locally and nationally with all of the individuals and groups that influence the teaching of English—with the 900,000 elementary and secondary teachers of English and with their educational leaders in state and regional associations, such as the 170 regional affiliates of the National Council of Teachers of English. Fortunately the strong participation of college English leaders in the Council and in many of its affiliates make this development less difficult than establishing permanent working relationships with four other types of groups or individuals concerned about the teaching of English, each of which I would like to discuss briefly: the administrators or education generalists, the supervisors, the specialists in some aspect of teaching English, and the English education specialists.

At least three general educational associations are organized nationally to review the needs and problems of particular groups of schools—the National Education Association, the National Catholic Educational Association, and the National Association of Independent Schools, each of which is concerned with curriculum as well as with other educational problems. These associations issue bulletins, prepare recommendations, and strive to improve classroom teaching. The National Education Association, for example, has recently launched a five-year, $500,000 project on the teaching of composition in the high school which calls for the testing of new practices in five high-school centers throughout the East. The National Catholic Educational Association last year appointed a national commission on English to seek solutions for key problems. Whatever college English professors may think about some of the activities of such organizations, their existence and potential influence cannot be ignored.

Working for the improved teaching of English also means working with school principals and superintendents, organized at national and state levels into such associations as the American Association of School Administrators, the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, and the Department of Elementary School Principals. Through journals and conventions, these groups seek to keep their members balanced in perspective. In some states, such as California, the school administrators actually control the programs for accrediting schools and thus have both the responsibilities and the opportunities involved in evaluating English programs. In most states, and certainly nationally, the administrators are among the more vocal, influential educational leaders.

Working for the improved teaching of English also means working with school supervisors and curriculum consultants, some of whom may be specialists in the teaching of English, but many more generalists attempting to assist teachers in several curricular areas. The supervisor is a key person for it is he, more than anyone else in a school district, who devotes full time and energy to improving instructional programs, to arranging for meetings and seminars for the continuing education of teachers, to assisting in the selection of textbooks that are used, and to supervising most new curriculum development projects in the schools. In fourteen states and in many large city systems, specialists for English supervision work on a full time or almost full time basis. More English specialists will probably be appointed and college departments might profitably assist schools in locating adequately trained persons to fulfill such important roles. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development is the national organization for curriculum specialists; it is organized into state chapters and not infrequently devotes much time at its meetings to analyzing aspects of the English curriculum.

Working for the improved teaching of English means establishing communication with specialists in various aspects of English teaching, such as the 90,000 members of the Association for Childhood Education International, who concentrate on the problems of teaching in primary schools. Or the educational researchers in the National Conference on Research in English, who provide useful annual summaries of research on pedagogical problems in English. Or the members of the International Reading Association—

specialists on the teaching of reading in schools and colleges— now numerically stronger than the Modern Language Association itself and with a momentum for growth that far outstrips that of the National Council. Or especially those in English education or the teaching of English who may hold appointments in English departments, in education, or perhaps joint appointments in both departments, and who stand in many ways between the two departments and need to keep abreast of both.

These are some of the individuals and groups already working to strengthen teaching in this country. They have much to contribute to English as well as much to learn about English, but their attempts to provide a quality education will be immeasurably strengthened by greater support from our college departments. Most of these associations and individuals will welcome advice and assistance from English specialists, whenever such help is offered in a genuinely cooperative way. But the road to achieving strong positive relationships will not be easy. In the process of meeting with these individuals, misunderstandings are likely to arise. A generalist in education, attempting to maintain some familiarity with all areas of learning, quite likely lacks real conversancy with any single one. Quite possibly the school administrator or supervisor will not ever have heard of the more recent developments in rhetoric or language, just as the college English teacher will be unfamiliar with some of the important new pedagogical studies of teaching effectiveness.

Albert H. Marckwardt has reminded us of the problems that we face in bringing college English and college education together when he told the Cooperative English Program, "Most professors of English derive their views of what goes on in Education classes from what amounts to fiction and folklore, just as they derive their notions of present-day elementary and secondary education from their own imperfect memories of their youth and these are sometimes less than accurate accounts. Members of Education faculties have their own mythology about pedagogical ineptitude and lack of realism of the subject-matter people, quite as prejudiced and unreasonable as ours." Certainly patience is required in working toward cooperative action, but a strong foundation can be built. And before college English departments become overly critical of professional workers in other fields, they might well examine the quality of the leadership which college English departments have provided over the years. If principals and superintendents seem not to possess the necessary basic knowledge of recent developments in English, what meetings or conferences have our colleges and universities sponsored to inform these key leaders? If state and large city supervisors of English do not possess exactly the academic qualifications that we deem desirable, what programs of preparation for such instructional supervisors are currently being offered in the universities? If present teachers of English seem not to be well prepared in the subjects they are teaching, what steps are being taken within the departments to make certain that tomorrow's teachers will be better prepared? Or to provide evening or summer courses to assist the teachers already in service?

Honest answers to questions of this kind will lead to a recognition of obligations with which college departments might begin immediately to meet. Certainly the willingness of college English teachers to admit some inadequacies in their own actions offers a welcome way of approaching members of other groups who have not always felt that past overtures to college English departments have been met either with support or with sympathy.

The way in which our college departments, and particularly the college department chairmen, respond to the present crisis in English teaching will determine the direction in which our English curriculum will go. If we wish to move in the direction of strengthening subject matter content, where else but from English departments can we expect our leadership to come? The choice before us seems manifest. I fervently hope that Jerome Bruner is substantially right in suggesting the model of the Nobel laureate as the symbol for what is happening in education today. The magnificent efforts of our colleagues in the sciences and in mathematics are already bearing rich fruit. But as linguist H. A. Gleason said earlier this year, "The real question is whether we can develop a curriculum in English to stand *with* the new programs in mathematics and science—a curriculum worthy of our subject matter and above all a curriculum worthy of the coming generations of young people."[2]

[2] H. A. Gleason, Jr., "What Is English?" *College Composition and Communication*, XIII (October 1962), 10.